AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES—VOL. V.—(XXV).—NOVEMBER, 1901.—NO. 5.

CHURCH BUILDING—XI.

Stained Glass Windows.

COLOR judiciously applied to the interior of a church constitutes one of its most pleasing features. But the form in which color gives most delight to the beholder is that in which it is seen streaming through our stained glass windows in the incomparable richness and variety of its hues. There it meets the eye, not merely as reflected by opaque bodies, but in its direct radiance. It is light itself, caught up in its course and transfigured by the transparent medium through which it reaches us.

I.

Colored glass is one of the most ancient discoveries of civilized man. In some of the earliest tombs of the Egyptian kings, built thousands of years before the Christian era, specimens of colored glass are met with, imitating those brilliant products of nature,—rubies, emeralds, sapphires and other precious stones with which men had already learned to adorn themselves or objects dear to them. Greeks and Romans continued the tradition and enlarged the process, as may be seen in the glass imitations of agate, onyx, and all kinds of precious marbles, gathered together in our museums; but nowhere do we find them employing the precious product in the decoration of windows. The first traces of such a practice occur in the descriptions which have reached us of some of the great churches of Rome, Gaul, and Constantinople, in the fifth and following centuries. Of the exact nature of the colored

glass used in them we can only form conjectures, for nothing of it has been preserved to us. The most ancient specimens we possess cannot be put back with assurance beyond the eleventh century. It is then, it will be remembered, that the great architectural movement began which pursued its course through the Middle Ages; and side by side with it we may follow the development of the art with which we are presently concerned. Brilliant and beautiful from the beginning, it assumes new forms in each successive period, so that at a glance the expert can recognize what work belongs to the twelfth, the thirteenth, or any of the following centuries. Amidst all its transformations it never ceased to be popular; and although Gothic architecture, to which it seemed to be indissolubly wedded, yielded at length to the tastes of the Renaissance, the colored windows survived, forming with the classic edifices a new alliance which lasted through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. But the union was never an entirely happy one. Gradually stained glass came to be neglected and fell into disuse. Sometimes the most beautiful products of an earlier period, no longer appreciated, were deliberately torn down to give admission to the broad light of day, in order to show off some new picture, or statue, or group, wrought in the modern style, or to supply more abundant light to the canons for the recitation of the office. Thus for well nigh two hundred years the art steadily declined until it came to be almost entirely forgotten.

It reappeared with the revival of Gothic architecture; very imperfect at first, but steadily improving as years went on, until, by dint of a close study of the earlier products and methods, and of improved processes in the manufacture of the material, it has become possible, not only to equal, but in many particulars to surpass the work of past ages. In the same measure the art has won back its lost popularity. To-day it is associated freely with every style of architecture. It shows itself everywhere in public halls and in private homes, as well as in sacred edifices; it is welcomed as warmly into Protestant as into Catholic churches. Whenever missing in the latter, its absence is at once felt; without it a church seems always cold and bare.

Hence, in the construction or renovation of our places of worship, unless they be only temporary structures soon to disappear,

the practical necessity of making provision for colored windows gives rise to many problems which the priest in charge must have his share in solving. To help him in the performance of such a duty the following remarks may not be unwelcome.

II.

First, as regards the material itself, there are two kinds of colored glass,—*stained glass* and *enameled glass.* **Stained Glass** is glass which is colored through and through, the metallic oxide which stains it green, yellow, blue, or any other color, being mixed with the white glass while in a state of fusion in the pot, for which reason it is technically called "pot metal." **Enameled Glass** is white glass with a design made on it in enamel. The process consists in grinding glass of any given color (or mingling the proper color with white glass) until it is reduced to impalpable dust, —mixing it with oil or liquid gum, and applying it as paint on the plate of glass which is to receive the design. If submitted to a proper degree of heat, the oil or gum will be destroyed and the colored glass will melt and adhere to the heated surface to which it has been applied.

For a long time the artist had only the first kind of glass at his disposal, nor did he use anything more to produce the most beautiful effects. Guided by an exquisite sense of harmony in color, he combined his richly dyed bits of glass so happily that each hue helped to set off those around it, and made the whole window seem as if it were set with jewels. Many of them are still to be seen in our European cathedrals; and in presence of their surpassing beauty one can understand how those who contemplated them for the first time were led to imagine that the artist must have managed somehow to fuse rubies, emeralds, and other precious stones into the substances that sent forth such a blaze of glory.

As transparent mosaics of rich and varied color, offering a feast simply to the eyes, nothing more could be wished for. But it has always been, as we have seen, the impulse of man once in possession of the art of design, to reproduce the form of living things, and especially of man himself. In the present case scenes of the Old Testament and of the Gospel, figures of Christ and of

the Saints shining through the many-colored glory of the windows would surely be, if it were possible to introduce them, a most welcome sight to the pious faithful. But to achieve such a task the means of execution, it must be admitted, were very imperfect. Any new color could be introduced only by a new bit of glass. Again, instead of the many tones and shades necessary for a colored representation, the artists of that early period had only a few of the primary and secondary colors,—blue, red, green, yellow, purple; and, as to design, while able to draw geometrical ornament with faultless accuracy, they generally knew no more of delineating human forms and features than an untaught schoolboy. Yet the attempt was made. With narrow strips of lead to bind the bits of glass together and to outline the figures, and with a kind of brown pigment to supply necessary details, they managed to work out their pictures,—medallions generally, inserted in the mosaic of the windows, and sharing in their brilliancy, so that the crudeness and confusion of the figures and the glaring defects of the drawing were lost, as it were, in the harmony and beauty of the colors, ever charming the eye even where they offered little to the mind.

This was but the beginning. In course of time the art of figure-drawing improved; sheets of glass of different colors were fused together, allowing the artist to produce varied and pleasing effects on the same piece of glass by removing certain parts on one side or the other. Again, about the beginning of the fourteenth century it was discovered that white or plain glass coated with a solution of silver would take in the furnace a pure, transparent stain of yellow, varying, according to its strength and the degree of heat, from palest lemon to deepest orange. This was an invaluable help, and remains so to the present day. With what enthusiasm it was welcomed by artists may be seen in the way they lavished its rich tones on their subsequent work. Right through the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries its resplendent glow may be noticed everywhere; in the golden hair of angels, in the crowns of kings, in the armor of knights, in the drapery of the Saints, in the nimbus that encircled their heads, above all in the canopies that enshrined them, filling up all the unoccupied space of the windows, and shedding something of sunshine through the mysterious gloom of the sacred edifice.

But what incomparably more than aught else enlarged the resources of the artist and led to the transformation of the art itself, was the process of coloring glass by the application of enamel. This brought with it a variety of new shades and colors and allowed the artist to apply them on the same sheet of glass almost with the freedom of the painter spreading his color on canvas. Many of our most beautiful windows are the outcome of this last progress. There are those who hold that in it the art reached its highest level, combining the conditions of perfect work more freely than at any previous period.

III.

The opening of the twentieth century finds us in possession of all that was known of the art in the past; enriched moreover with ever growing resources due to modern science. The rediscovered craft, confined for a time to servile and not always happy imitation, is once more a live art, free, active, and progressive. In England, in Belgium, in Germany it reckons large and flourishing establishments. France alone can boast of as many as two hundred *ateliers*, great and small, of which about eighty are located in Paris. Hitherto these countries have supplied nearly all the colored windows that adorn our churches. Like the other arts this one was slow to develop amongst us; but now that it is started, it is likely to progress with exceptional rapidity. Already stained glass windows are manufactured in many of our great cities, some of them equal to the best to be found abroad. Indeed, the products of Tiffany, of New York, are now considered superior in some ways to any contemporary work. But although there is a steady progress everywhere in the practical and mechanical sides of the art, the fundamental processes remain unchanged. Of these something may be said here.

While offering results similar to those of the painter, the methods of stained glass work have to be entirely different. The painter is untrammeled in the conception of his subject. He spreads out his canvas to any size and in any shape he likes, and fills it with figures which stand out on a darker background, and varies their size according to the laws of perspective. For the maker of a stained-glass window there is far less freedom of

action, and his mode of operation is much more elaborate. His first care is to imagine a design that will fit in the frame already determined by the size, shape, and accidents of the aperture he has to fill. Next, he has to work out in detail the manner of transforming that design, or rather reproducing it in colored glass. If he works only in "pot metal," each different bit of color will demand a different bit of glass; and all these pieces will have to be cut so as to fit into one another, like those of a puzzle. In many of them a certain amount of shading will be necessary, which will have to be done by the application of enamel. This latter is appealed to as a necessity for all manner of details, ornamental designs, and the like. The artist applies with his brush the proper design in liquid enamel of a suitable color and burns it into the pieces of glass. The effect of the enamel is never the same coming out of the kiln as entering it. The operator takes this into account, but even so, he may be disappointed in his anticipations and have to begin over and over again before getting the exact tone or effect he looks for. When all the pieces have been thus prepared, they are set up in their proper order with a view to test them. If the tone of any piece of glass is found unsatisfactory, another is substituted in its place; if the design or shading of a bit of enamel-work is faulty, it is taken out and done over again. When all has thus been tried and has won approval, the pieces are taken asunder and put up for good in the way already mentioned. The leads are thick enough to admit of a groove being made in both edges into which the pieces of glass are fitted, the lead by its extreme flexibility lending itself freely to their varying contours; while, being pressed upon their inserted edges, it holds them firmly together.

This network of leads, originally resorted to as a necessity, is now admitted to be, when properly handled, a resource in the hands of the artist and a positive element of beauty. Thus in the delineation of figures or of distinct objects, these dark, heavy lines mark them off with a vigor not to be attained in any other acceptable way. Even where they do not help the drawing, they can be managed so as not to interfere with it. When gathered round bits of richly colored glass, they serve admirably to bring out by contrast their bright and radiant hues. In the experi-

mental period of recovery which the art traversed towards the middle of the last century, an attempt was made to do away with leads altogether. The size of the sheets of glass available as well as the unlimited resources of coloring in enamel made the attempt successful, but the effect was so unsatisfactory that the practice of leading continued to hold its own.

IV.

When the time has come for the priest to give orders in this matter, many practical questions arise for which he has to be prepared. One of the first regards the kind of windows he should order. They may be of two different kinds: grisaille and "picture windows." *Grisaille windows* contain no figures; only patterns drawn on white or lightly tinted glass, and sometimes brightened up by bits of rich color worked into the design or disposed in the shape of a border. The advantages of grisaille are cheapness and a greater abundance of light. At the time when deep, rich color prevailed, the solemn obscurity which it shed through the church was occasionally relieved by the use of grisaille. It found its natural home down in the basements and up in the clerestory, where more light was needed to show off the beauties of the inner roof and to give airiness to the whole structure. It would naturally serve the same purposes in our time, besides being used as a temporary arrangement where resources are insufficient to set up all the windows together in the rich pictorial style; for however beautiful in their way grisaille windows may be, what the popular eye chiefly looks for are the personage and the picture.

Single figures are relatively inexpensive, one being sufficient to decorate a single aperture. The rest of it may be filled with grisaille, mosaic, or an architectural canopy brightened with silver stain admitting a rich profusion of light.

Scenes are more interesting, but they entail more labor and expense, on account of the number of figures and details that are crowded into them; and wherever it is possible to have them of the right kind they should be introduced. They filled the windows of our mediæval cathedrals, making them into so many glowing pages of a book which told the whole history of Religion.

The great personages of the Old and New Testaments were all there; the Blessed Virgin in the various forms under which Catholic devotion honored her; Christ Himself in the familiar mysteries of His life and death. It was truly a wonderful book open to all, in which the most illiterate could read each day and rehearse all the principal doctrines of their faith. In the single cathedral of Chartres in France, there were one hundred and fifty-six windows, filled with religious subjects to the number of fourteen hundred!

Sacred art lavished in such magnificent proportions cannot be thought of among us. But in most of our churches there is room for something of it. One large window would suffice to accommodate in medallion shape the scenes of the Passion, or the mysteries of the Rosary; another might represent the scenes of the life of our Lord; another the Seven Sacraments, and so on. What a delightful theme for the preacher in his instructions and exhortations to young and old! How these striking pictures intelligently explained would become, as often as looked up to, a source of edification to the faithful, and would impress themselves on their memory and follow them through life as a blessed and abiding impression!

Painting on glass has its special laws and limitations which distinguish it from work done on opaque surfaces. Thus there is no room in it for contrast of light and shade. Any attempt at representing the latter results only in producing a dingy, dirty color. As a consequence, the figures cannot be made to stand out as in an ordinary picture; neither can they be foreshortened to any extent. Of perspective, as of shading, there can be little more than a suggestion. All the figures of a subject have to be represented nearly on the same plane and consequently of about the same size. They are generally crowded, because the space is limited, and must be made the most of. Treated as in ordinary pictures, they would dwindle into insignificance. Hence in composition and arrangement the stained glass picture is essentially conventional. It is conventional also in color; owing to its decorative character as well as to its transparency; it excludes deep shades and dark colors, and demands that all the figures shall stand in full light. Personages robed in black have no

place in such compositions. Yet in subjects of a solemn or sad character the colors should be subdued.[1]

Whatever the subject chosen, whatever the style adopted, the primary law of the artist remains that of all decorative painting—*harmony of color*. There is no real necessity of ever departing from it. To this we would add: *richness of color*, remembering however that the latter has its limitations in the amount of light which it is practically necessary to admit. The more intense the color, the less light enters. In early times the windows were magnificent in their radiance, but the interiors were poorly lighted. Little inconvenience indeed arose therefrom. Very few of the faithful used books in church, and the clergy knew by heart most of what was said or sung. Not so in modern times. For priests and people alike books are a practical necessity in the celebration of the Church services, and the books used are often in small type. Something therefore has to be sacrificed of the rich glow of color as well as of the mysterious gloom which so impresses the soul in the old cathedrals of Europe. Yet as much as possible of both should be retained; and we may add that the in-

[1] How far a principle so obvious is sometimes forgotten, may be seen by the following denunciation from the pen of an English architect, E. Sharpe. The subject is the Crucifixion:

"The central figure is, of course, that of our Saviour on the cross. His loins are girt with cloth of ultramarine blue, having a rose-colored lining. On the left stands the Blessed Virgin, clad in what appears to be a green-baize wrapper, lined with salmon-colored taffeta, and an undergarment of bright vermillion, adorned with gold-embroidered collar, cuffs, and border. At the foot of the cross is Mary Magdalene, clad in a Prussian-blue upper-garment and pea-green robe. She wears a collar of apparently silver filigree-work round her neck. On the right stands St. John, in raiment of three colors,—scarlet, blue, and green. Next to him is seen St. Mark, in a diapered amber-colored vesture, over which is thrown a green cloak or toga, lined with violet; and on the opposite side is St. Luke, in equally brilliant garments.

"To describe the whole of the other figures in this picture—in all sixteen—would be tedious; suffice it to say that they share among them the whole of the six primary and secondary colors of the prismatic spectrum, contrasted and combined pretty much in the manner already described.

"It is impossible for a moment to be blind to the fact that the object of the designer of this window, in which the most portentous event in sacred history is unintentionally converted into a harlequinade, has been, not to present a truthful picture of the Crucifixion, but to seek in the clothing of the divine and saintly personages that are introduced, a field for the lavish display of the gaudiest colors of the glass-stainers' workshop."

creased facilities of generating artificial light makes this more practicable than it was even twenty years ago. Without appealing to artificial light at all, the introduction of movable panels in the stained glass, such as are used in ordinary windows for ventilation, would suffice to admit the necessary amount of light from outside when the hour grows late or the skies are clouded. Finally, while making the main portion of the building fairly lightsome, it would be perfectly admissible to darken those chapels and shrines of special devotion where reading is little thought of and prayer is poured forth all day long.

This last remark applies to the parts of the church which the eye does not take in with the rest. All the windows that belong to the same order, above and below, should, in obedience to the principle of unity, be of the same kind, and supply the same amount of light. Two windows placed side by side might be perfect, each in its own way; but if one is dark and the other bright, they interfere with each other, and the effect of both is positively spoiled. Consequently before the first window of the series is set up, the general effect of its repetition in the others has to be carefully considered.

Much attention has also to be given to the kind and quantity of light that will fall on each window. Nothing more than this ever varying light separates colored glass work from ordinary paintings. A picture being seen always in the same light produces always the same effect. A stained-glass window, on the contrary, is never the same at any two hours of the day. Like a landscape, like an expanse of water, like all that depends for its beauty on the skies, it is ever changing, sometimes looking at its best, sometimes at its worst. Bright sunshine falling directly upon it will send its various hues floating through the air, coloring fancifully all the objects they meet; but, contrary to popular opinion, it may not improve in any degree the window itself. In fact only the thick, deep-dyed glass of early times or its modern imitations can affront with impunity the direct rays of the sun; to all the rest they give a weak, washy appearance. It is, as a rule, under the diffused light of the sky, clear but without sunshine, that colored windows are at their best.

Besides beauty of tone and harmony of assortment, there is a

third quality of color which should not be lost sight of,—its solidity. Color imbedded in the very body of the glass cannot wear off and it hardly ever fades. Not so the enamel by which the shading is done and details of all kinds are delineated. It may not be proof against the corrosive influence of the atmosphere, or its coloring matter may gradually weaken, or, if imperfectly applied, it may actually peel off and disappear, leaving the painted surface defaced by spots of crude color or bare, white patches.[2] Unscrupulous craftsmen will sometimes go the length of finishing their work with touches of ordinary paint, sufficient to save appearances when the windows are put up, but incapable of enduring exposure for any length of time.

All this is best avoided by dealing with respectable firms. Those of this country are not so available as might be expected. Either their work is crude, or when satisfactory it is too costly; or again it is not of the kind suited to Catholic churches, the experience of the artists being confined to Protestant places of worship or to secular edifices for which they sometimes execute very beautiful work. But there is no reason why this condition of things should be anything but transitory. Already there are signs among us of a satisfactory supply being near at hand.

There is this great convenience in the matter of colored windows, that they are among the things that can best afford to wait. Neither is it necessary that they should be all put up together. In the old cathedrals they were often separated from each other by many generations. Most of them were gifts, individual or collective. A feudal lord offered one; a pious church dignitary another; a guild presented a third, and so on. Many of them still bear the mark of their origin,—the insignia of the corporation, or the family arms of the lord, or, it may be his portrait at the bottom of the picture with that of his wife and children doing homage to some saint. The privilege of going down thus to posterity helped doubtless to multiply these gifts, and would be found just as effective in our times. There are few objects that

[2] Much of the shading is now coming to be done without enamel, by employing properly selected bits of stained glass (pot metal). The rich assortment of material which the artist now finds at his disposal in well supplied workshops (several hundred shades and tones) makes this possible, though tedious; and the result is more solid and brilliant.

people are more ready to subscribe to or pay for than memorial windows.

Before parting with the subject, we would recommend those who have large orders to give and wish to watch the execution of them, to make themselves further acquainted with the whole question by reading some special works dealing with it. In England, in France, in Belgium, and Germany such works abound, either separately, or in connection with the general subject of Architecture. We know of no book of the kind published in this country. Perhaps the volume brought out some years ago in London, *Stained Glass Windows*, by Lewis Day, would be the most interesting and the most accessible.

J. HOGAN.

DOES THEOLOGY PRESERVE RELIGION?

THE student who is told at the outset of his seminary career that logic and metaphysics are handmaidens of theology, is apt to forget that in his own case during the past years of his life, his theology, or more accurately, his religion, has been ministered to by other and more humble servitors. Philosophy and its methods have entered but little into the forming of his religious convictions. The example of a pious mother, the ritual of the Church, hymns, prayers, music, the sense of duty, the charm of godliness—such have been, under grace, the means by which his faith has been developed.

His study of religion as a science will give him a wider knowledge and a clearer understanding of the principles of his faith; it will supply him with a well-ordered system, and a defensible basis of belief; but it will not add to the certainty of his convictions. And unless he preserves in his theological studies that same personal attitude towards the truths of religion which marked his early years, there is danger that his living faith may degenerate into a mere intellectual perception of abstract relations.

Of course theology, to be a science at all, must, like every other science, make use of logical methods and metaphysical principles. Nor is there any doubt that revealed truth admits of the use of exact methods; in other words, theology is a true

science. But the difficulty is that logical methods, though perfect in their way, are wofully inadequate, and their inadequacy is never more noticeable than when they are applied to religion.

This is resultant on a truth which is phrased by the ancients—"Scientia est de universalibus." Science deals with abstractions; it attains its perfect certainty at the expense of the existing things, by not considering them in their mode of existence in the order of reality; it considers the universal; it is out of immediate touch with individuals. There are some sciences, such as logic and mathematics, which are specially adapted to this mode of treatment; but it falls far short of expressing the full content of such a many-sided topic as religion and its revelation in Jewish history and in the life and words of Jesus Christ.

This may be called the objective difficulty. A subjective difficulty arises from the fact that science appeals to one faculty in man, while religion is as manifold in its phases as human nature can possibly be in its demands; moreover, science is impersonal, while religion is the most intimately personal thing in human life.

So whether we consider the content of religious truth or the nature of man, it becomes evident that our scientific methods of investigation and presentation must be supplemented by other methods which are better fitted to express the beauty and charm of religious associations, and more varied and more personal in their appeal to the individual; that is, by methods which, as distinguished from scientific, are generally called literary.

Neither the scientific nor the literary method has ever been exclusively employed. Man is not a mere logical machine, neither is he merely a sentimental being; but among different men and in different ages we can detect a tendency towards either extreme. Thus some men, in whose nature religion fills the most important need, are inclined to make it almost altogether a matter of sentiment. Such religion tends to become mere sentimentality and pietism. On the other hand there are those who approach all religious questions in a scientific spirit, and their religion ends in formalism or rationalism; it never reaches the heights of faith and self-sacrifice towards which the religious spirit aspires. The true position lies between these extremes; but it is hard to reach, and harder still to hold. The difficulty of doing justice to the

claims of both reason and feeling is increased by the needs of the times. Not the least among the ills which heresy has wrought is the suspicion or intolerance it has aroused among many of our leaders of thought of a personal approach to religious truth or a literary presentation of it. We incline towards a text-book view of religion as something comprised in a set of hard-and-fast logical formulæ, set over against certain errors. This view serves a valuable purpose as guaranteeing the interests of truth; but for the life of the spirit, religious truth must be viewed as a living seed growing to fulness in the kindly soil of a Christian soul. This intimate personal view is generally obscured by our severe logical methods which present religion as dogmatic and apologetic, as something to argue about rather than as something to love.

Any attempt to balance the scales between intellect and feeling must take into consideration the present position of its beams. Thus in dealing with Protestants it is usually necessary to throw weight into the scale of reason. But if our own scales be examined it will be found that one of its arms is weighted to the ground with logic. This being the case, it may be considered not untimely to attempt the task of marking the limitations of the scientific treatment of religion, which we shall do from the points of view of history, psychology, and utility.

It must be acknowledged that there is danger that, in trying to make the balance level, too much weight may be thrown into the other side. To prevent this, counterweights must be used, that is to say, a statement of position, such as this paper purports to be, must be made with numerous and perhaps tedious reservations. But it is only in connection with such reservations that statements concerning the emotional or volitional or personal element in religion can be truthfully made or fairly judged. In brief, then, the position taken is that scientific theology, though in the last analysis paramount, is far from being the sole factor in religion; and that on account of the semi-official neglect of subordinate factors, their claims demand strong presentation.

The most striking argument in favor of the claims of the methods of literature and the faculties of will and feeling is that they correspond most closely with the divine way of imparting

truth. In the Sacred Books there is little attempt at systematic or logical presentation of revelation. They are eminently literary in form and method, and have been important as a basis of literary expression in every language in Christendom. They teach by poem and story and parable and analogy. The prophetic style is not argumentative, but hortatory. The prophets say, "Thus saith the Lord God;" they assert the truth and reiterate it; they do not stop to prove it. They appeal to faith and fear and love and shame rather than to pure reason. They convince by persuading the will. And even when they use argument, like St. Paul, there is little attempt at perfection of logical form. The merest tyro in philosophy in any of our seminaries will show more familiarity with the rules of the syllogism than does St. Paul. Cardinal Newman says: "In all ages of the world, no religion yet has been a religion of physics or of philosophy. It has ever been synonymous with revelation. It has never been a deduction from what we know; it has ever been an assertion of what we are to believe. It has never lived in a conclusion; it has ever been a message, a history, a vision. No legislator or priest ever dreamed of educating our moral nature by science or argument."[1]

So too in the greatest period of Christian writing, the Fathers were eminently literary in form and method. They even encouraged the study of the heathen poets whose tenets they abhorred, in order that Christian youth should have at their command the greatest human means for the defence of truth—the beauties of literary style. We see, indeed, the growing demand for systematic and logical presentation of dogma in their controversial writings and in the decisions of the Church Councils; but this spirit was of slow growth and was stimulated largely from without by pagan philosophy. The religious consciousness in most men awakes to the need of logic only when forced to be apologetic. It is pushed back to its principles when put on its defence. Accordingly, in all ages the Church has refrained from defining dogmatic beliefs until such definitions have been made necessary by the denial of truth. And so in those early centuries the Christian theologians began the coördination of beliefs into a system under the attacks of heretics, and sought for a philo-

[1] *Grammar of Assent*, p. 96.

sophical basis for the whole system in order to square their beliefs with the philosophy of the ethnic world. But still, even in men like Augustine and Basil, their method was literary, not scholastic; and to this day it is the revelation of deep personal feeling, of doubt dispelled, of passion conquered, of conviction attained with difficulty but with honesty, that leaves the deepest impression on the reader, and puts him in the same disposition of mind as St. Augustine himself when he said, "Si isti, cur non ego?" If their great, honest, luminous minds came to these conclusions, why should not I do so also? And when any man has gone far enough to have such dispositions, he is already more than half converted to the faith.

It was left to the Middle Ages to make of theology an exact science. The scholastic theologians and philosophers were men who dared to know. They tested religious truths by the most rigid Aristotelian logic, and proved for all time that the revelations of the Most High contain no inconsistencies with one another or with the truths which may be revealed by human reason. There has been no period in the history of human thought of more subtle speculation, more rigid logic, more exact thinking; but there has been no period of intellectual activity which has produced so few written works that can be called literary. The scholastics set themselves the task of determining objective truth, and they were suspicious of all forms of writing or speech which would not submit themselves to the test of logic. In many respects the world is their debtor, as it always is to those who devote their labors to defining or extending the limits of truth. Those who add to the sum of human knowledge, speculative or positive, need not regard language except as a means of conveying the fruits of their research. The duty of presenting this research work in attractive form is incumbent on those of us who reap where we have not sown, and feel virtuous if we do not come under Speaker Reed's witty accusation against a Congressman, that every time he opened his mouth he subtracted from the sum of human knowledge.

To the scholastics also all forms of writing are indebted for the fact that they taught Europe how to think, and that they gave that exact determination to the value of language without which the expression of the finer shades of thought is impossible.

But the verbal manifestations of that religious emotion which they undoubtedly felt, were crushed ruthlessly out. The personal attitude towards religion showed itself in other ways—in music, painting, sculpture, architecture, the institutions of knighthood and of chivalry, and in the attitude towards life which makes the Middle Ages the golden age of romance. In astronomy and in physics, even in agriculture, the hand of the priest is evident. Literature alone, of all the means of moving the mind of man, gathered not with religion, but scattered. It is sad that the beginnings of literature in every European language except Italian, where Dante shines out glorious, are filled with the spirit of individualistic opposition to the hard formation into which the intellectual side of Catholicism had drifted.

And so when the revival of Greek learning came in with the spread of wealth and time for indolent culture among the middle classes, the old hard-and-fast system of thinking went to pieces amid the laughter of a generation which demanded of philosophy not objective and *a priori* truth, but a correspondence with life as life appeared to them. The attitude which the new generation took towards the old philosophy is shown by the following extract from John Locke's journal:

"One day when I rode out only to an airing, I was had to a foddering of chopped hay or logic forsooth. Poor *materia prima* was canvassed cruelly, stripped of all the gay dress of her forms and shown naked to us, though I must confess I had not eyes enough to see her. However, the dispute was good sport . . . The young monks (which one would not guess by their looks) are a subtle people, which dispute as eagerly for *materia prima* as if they were to make their dinner on it, and perhaps it is sometimes all their meal, for which others' charity is more to be blamed than their stomach. The professor of philosophy . . . was topfull of distinctions which he produced with so much gravity and applied with so good a grace that ignorant I began to admire logic again and could not have thought that 'Simpliciter aut secundum quid materialiter et formaliter' had been such gallant things."

These extracts, as Dr. McCosh remarks, "furnish a vivid picture of the new philosophy represented by Locke, in its con-

fidence and pride, taking a parting look at the old philosophy, represented by the scholastic discussions, passing away in the midst of weakness and ridicule." And we may add that this same John Locke with his easy style and simple method had unfortunately more influence than any other man in determining the trend of English philosophic thought for two hundred years.

The change of attitude on philosophic questions in the sixteenth century was the long-delayed revolt of personality against dogmatism. The steam had been pent up in the boiler for many generations, and when it forced its way out there was catastrophe. Aristotle was rejected for Plato, Dante for Horace, the *Summa* for the Bible. The passion of these times for preaching and being preached at, the devotion to the Bible, and especially to its most obscure passages, the absurd character of the heresies which were accepted by millions, should be a lasting lesson to us as to how much the ordinary man is influenced by emotion, and how little by logic, in reaching religious convictions; or, to put it differently, how far theology, to be practical, should be literary rather than scientific.

And this leads us to the crucial question, To what extent should we allow ourselves to be influenced or to influence the beliefs of others by the emotions of the will? We may answer in general that God is the term of all our activities; that He not only guarantees all objective truth, but that He is the end to which our volitions tend and in which our affections must find rest. And since religion is the means by which we draw nigh to God, it must fill all the capabilities of our nature. But this is no complete answer to the logical question as to whether or not we are justified in allowing the emotional and volitional part of us to determine in any way our convictions. And if this question be pressed, we must answer unhesitatingly that reason, and not will or feeling must be the criterion of all our beliefs. Any concession made to feeling as a guide in the formation of our judgments must be ultimately passed upon by the faculty of reason. We must agree with Emerson's advice: "Hold yourself fast by the intellect. It is the domineering temper of the sensual world that creates the extreme need of the priests of science, and it is the office and right of the intellect to make and not take its estimate."

The authority of the intellect in the hierarchy of faculties must be defended against all forms of subjectivism or fideism whatsoever. The examination which we here undertake is not logical, but psychological. It is an undoubted fact that men form their strongest convictions under the influence of imagination, feeling, and desire; and that we are little fitted for our work as teachers of religion until we have taken that personal attitude towards it as the complement of all our faculties, which will enable us to present it to unthinking men as living, breathing, soul-filling, God-given truth. Anyone who makes a study of his own strongest convictions—I mean those which influence his life and thought most strongly—will feel the inadequacy of the syllogism to express their force to himself or to others. He may be able to prove their correspondence to objectivity, or he may not; but if they are really living he cannot show their full cogency by dialectics; he must appeal to rhetoric. Take friendship, devotion, patriotism, religion; all the things for which we stand ready to smite or be smitten—not one of them is as clearly demonstrable as the rules of the syllogism or the 47th proposition of Euclid; but for neither of these is any man a martyr.

It may be said that no truth becomes vital until it has squared itself with the ideas and dispositions which it finds already in possession. Until it has done so, it lies like a rock in a plowed field, obstructing where it cannot fertilize. That is particularly true of religious truth, which accommodates itself as far as it can to the body of truth already in possession. Unless we grant that this is so, and that God would have it so, there are difficulties in the mode of statement of revealed truth and in the development of doctrine that cannot be solved. Scholasticism was able to determine truth in certain instances only relatively to the body of belief and modes of expression of the times. We find, however, that its great minds have reached a satisfactory solution of many of the great problems of thought, and accordingly we force our minds into thinking in the hard forms and dead crystallized language that were their instruments, in order that we may avoid ambiguity and self-deception and get a grip on necessary and universal relations. It is good, indeed, it is necessary, for us to do so. No man can go through this training in careful thinking and

accurate expression without being in many ways the better for it, and few could achieve any systematic presentation of truth without it. But the method has three defects, the remedy for which must be the use of other and more personal methods, not, of course, to displace it, but to supplement it. The first defect is that the truth often does not come home to us under scientific formulæ; the second, that the whole content of religion cannot be attained to by scientific methods; and the third, that very little can be imparted through this medium.

The first difficulty is psychological. Our mind is so constituted that even when highly trained in the use of the reasoning faculty, the assent which it gives to a proposition can be made more keen and more intimate by joining, as Cardinal Newman would say, a real assent to the notional assent; and religion, to be vital, must be a matter of real assents.

The second difficulty is from the side of revealed truth itself, which is so copious and fruitful that it overflows all the little word-casements that attempt to contain it, and so many-sided that it transcends the capacity of any faculty to grasp it.

The third difficulty is a practical one,—that the vast majority of the people, for the salvation of whose souls the theologian is working, have neither the inclination to hear nor the capacity to understand fine-spun arguments and long-drawn trains of discussion. These three difficulties we shall consider in order.

Now for the first, that often the truth does not really come home, even to trained minds, under scholastic formulæ. It is the perennial trial of teachers of philosophy and theology that bright students can study the loftiest questions of human thought for six years with little indication of personal approach to the matter. They know the book by memory thoroughly; but they give evidence that they view the questions as mere forms of words which forms of words will answer, and not as living truths palpitating with actuality. In the Middle Ages students lustily broke one another's crowns over these same questions in many a gentle and joyous encounter in the lanes of Paris and Salern; but to the modern generation they are too frequently a mass of misty verbiage—words, words, words. The reason for this is not to be sought in the dulness of the students, for they take a lively and

intelligent interest in current topics; and if it be found in their lack of interest in theological questions, the cause of this lack of interest is worth searching out. Among the main causes may be enumerated the difficulty of assimilating thoughts expressed in a strange tongue, and the defect of appreciation of how the principles studied affect the modern world, a defect which arises from a want of acquaintance with literature and a consequent absence of sympathetic understanding of human nature and its difficulties. Another reason is the exaggerated fear of anything like originality in religious questions, which injures the mental growth of a theologian during his student years, and later manifests itself as suspicion and criticism of any such tendency in others. These causes help to strengthen that attitude of mind on religious questions which the Rev. George Tyrrell, S.J., in his timely and searching work, *External Religion*, calls "the abuse of the external means of light." It consists in mental sloth, which attempts to justify its lack of works by faith, on the ground that since God has revealed and the Church defined what is necessary and sufficient to believe, it is foolishness or rashness or pride in us to think too deeply or too personally about such things. Father Tyrrell thus sums up the results of such a disposition:

"This mistake manifests itself sometimes in a total apathy and listlessness of mind, as in the case of those who simply hold on to the Church as they might hold on to a book, satisfied to know that it contains the truth, without ever caring to open it, or turn over its leaves; sometimes in a certain narrow cock-sure orthodoxy, most alien from the gentle diffidence of humble faith,—as in the case of those who know their catechism well by heart, and carry cut-and-dried answers to all difficulties, wrapped up in pellets to shoot out on occasion; to whom everything is clear and common sense, and obvious; who can define a mystery, but have never felt one. That the human words and ideas in which external truths are clad cannot, even through divine skill, convey more to us than a shadow of the realities they stand for; that they cannot, like numbers, be added, subtracted, and multiplied together so as to deduce new conclusions with arithmetical simplicity and accuracy, never occurs to them when they are instructing others as ignorant; or refuting them as idiotic; or rebuking them as immoral. For such persons religion has the same kind of interest

as the multiplication table, and no more. There is nothing mysterious, or beautiful, or awful about it; nothing to feed the mind or to subdue it with inexhaustible wonder."

It is evident that the intellectual apprehension of religion as objectively true is altogether insufficient to fill our religious needs or capabilities. We must make it subjective, personal. We may strive to get a hold on the truth, but it is not enough; we must let the truth get hold of us. It must come home to us; it must be transfused with personality; it must mingle with our everyday thought and feeling; it must shape itself to our familiar modes of expression; in a word, in neat scholastic form, it must be received "secundum modum recipientis." It is in neat capsules such as this that we get our little doses of scholastic truth. This is all well in its way; it is easy to carry around in this form. But the difficulty is that the capsule is too often made, not of gelatine, but of gutta percha. The medicine contained in it may be good; but the form does not admit of assimilation "secundum modum recipientis." We cannot go on thinking what should be our highest thoughts under alien forms, while our lower flights find expression in ways that are according to our disposition. We must examine how theological truth fits in with our nature, and our disposition, and our circumstances, and our modes of expression, and the way of thinking and manner of living of men about us. We must make it present, personal, individual. True, there is danger in all this, danger of self-opinionatedness, of intellectual cock-sureness, of that rampant individualism which is the worst form of dogmatism; but it is a risk we must run. We must dare to know. Lack of faith is not our difficulty, unless it be that worst form of infidelity which fears to look at the truth. Our main drawback is a certain intellectual sloth which masquerades as faith. We are heirs to the fortune of truth, and we can take our ease in our inn, while the sweating, struggling world passes by. We have no duties to this wealth; we can let our mines lie idle and our fields lie fallow. We do not get the most out of it, it is true, but we have cakes and ale, while others must put up with black bread and small beer.

Is this picture overdrawn? Is it not true that many of our best minds are simply working over old exhausted fields, while

they might be planting the old seed in fresh ground? Is it not true that many theologians fail to understand, even refuse to investigate, modern difficulties and tendencies, try to browbeat their graceful, smiling adversaries by a snarling Latin verb or that universal refutation, *Absurdum est*,—in fact, as Dryden remarks, come to battle like a dictator from the plough? Is it not true that wisdom is stored up in costly, unreadable folios, while error may be bought on any street corner for a penny, written that any man may read? not true that many students annex—it is the only word that describes the process—annex in some mysterious way a certain minimum of theological lore in the seminary which they carefully refrain from increasing afterwards except on compulsion, and which they administer in solid indigestible chunks to a long-suffering people? not true that in our theologies and ascetic works written to-day, we do not even change the examples which did service 600 years ago, and we still write of killing the innocent by shooting arrows at a tower in this age of lyddite shells and Maxim guns, and still drive home our arguments to a democratic people by talking of slaves striking their masters and kings visiting the huts of peasants? The old faith does not change and does not need to change, but we must find new approaches to it, and new ways of presenting it. "Non nova sed nove" must be our motto. To do this we need men of faith, men who will not call the council of their own little prejudices sacrosanct and œcumenic; but men too who, in Locke's expressive phrase, "have raised themselves above the alms-basket and are not content to live lazily on scraps of begged opinions." They must, moreover, as has been hinted, be men of sufficient courage to withstand the criticism of those who suspect *a priori* every idea that has not had the test of time. The tribe of Ephraim will always meet hard usage at the hands of the rigidly orthodox, and the fate of men who express themselves as best in them lies may be seen in the little episode which a translator of the Book of Judges phrases with almost humorously grim directness. "Then said they unto him, Say now Shibboleth, and he said Sibboleth, for he could not frame to pronounce it right. Then they took him, and they slew him at the passages of Jordan."

Our next point, that the whole content of religious verity does

not admit of being expressed in scientific form, has already been touched upon. Let us go back to metaphysics in order to have a sure basis for our position. The same being has different phases of truth, goodness, and beauty. Now these three phases can be apprehended by us primarily in only one way,—they must enter in at the gate of knowledge. Once in, they appeal to different faculties: truth to the intellect, goodness to the will, beauty to the feeling. Reason, however, must remain the test, the only ultimate test we can have. It is in accordance with this test that we form the logical principle that evidence is the criterion of certitude, the ethical principle that our wishes and desires should conform themselves to right reason, the theological principle that dogma is the soul of devotion. But as we are constituted, reason is a clumsy test. It can outline the path that will and feeling should travel; it can set them on their way; it can restrain and moderate them; but it cannot bind them close to itself. It can serve as a rein, but not as a halter. Or to put it differently, reason makes a broad, straight, level road towards the end to be obtained, but we miss the best of the journey if we scorch along the middle of the road looking neither to the right nor the left. We must amble along, deviating into the side paths and admiring the beauties of the scene without departing from the main line of travel.

In fact, most of what is best in nature and in life, which makes life most worth living, is incapable of logical analysis or logical expression. Our generous enthusiasms, the instinct of devotion, the outpouring of friendship, the inspiration of noble deeds, the witchery and weirdness of nature, the charm of music, laughter, bubbling gaiety and light-heartedness, pleasant pensive melancholy, love, patriotism, faith—oh! how weak are words to express these things! how impotent is dull reason to appreciate or measure them! Truly, as Pascal says, the heart has its reasons that reason does not know. Imagine logic with its penny tape and grocer's-scales trying to measure or weigh these emotions; or compare the explanations given in some ponderous German or Latin treatise on Æsthetic with the feelings they try to analyze.

These finer feelings are so elusive and personal that they transcend the capacity of human speech to give them adequate expression. And in speech, the only method that serves in any

degree to express or arouse them is the literary. Any attempt at demonstration is destructive of them. They are tendrils which humanity throws out towards the infinite; and the pruning-knife of logic serves only to cut them off. They satisfy our moods largely because we do not understand; we know that we do not understand everything, that the world is full of mystery; and we feel that we draw nearer to the infinite when we transcend evidence and reach out into the unlimited and the vague. Feeling, like faith, is the evidence of things not seen. Wordsworth never saw

> "The light that never was on sea or land."

Nor did Keats ever see those

> "Magic casements opening on the foam
> Of perilous seas, in faery lands forlorn."

Who can analyze the magic of phrase or the feeling which comes up in our hearts at the mere repetition of the lines:

> "The tender grace of a day that is dead,
> Can never come back to me."

A boy with literary feeling will get oceans of pleasure out of a poem which he only half understands, like Gray's Elegy or the Rime of the Ancient Mariner, because he is free to feel the swing and the spirit of it. Let anyone try to analyze the cause of the emotions aroused by reading a poem of Edgar Allen Poe, with its peculiar repetitions and musical intonations, and the weirdness of effect, or the well-known emotional value of a ballad refrain half meaningless in itself, such as "The Bonnie Green Woods of Killeevy," "John Anderson, my Jo," "The Days of auld Lang Syne," "Och! Corrymela and the blue sky over it," "The Bonnie Holms of Yarrow."

Try to put any of these phrases into another language, or even alter the dialect to good English, and you will find how much more there is in language than definition can express. Everyone knows how clumsy a guide the best possible dictionary is; everyone has felt in the earlier days at least of his classical studies how small was the response of feeling in him to what the Latins and Greeks considered poetry. This is because words are living things. We can express what they positively denote

by a definition or a translation. But we miss their connotation, the associations which have grown up around them, what might be called their suggestiveness as distinguished from expressiveness. Everyone acquainted with literature knows that there are certain forms under which a given idea means more to him than if it were differently expressed. To this class of expressions belong all the archaisms and localisms which are the stock in trade of the writers of romance, which is the literature of feeling. Every student knows the peculiar old-world flavor of the English of "the spacious days of Great Elizabeth;" and how reading it lifts us out of the briers of this working-day world into the pleasant land of romance. And it is because the religious spirit craves for something more than bread alone, something more soul-satisfying than the "straw chopped out by dialectics," that it seizes on these expressions which give play to feeling. One of the sorest trials of "general convertites" from Protestantism is giving up the beautiful translation of Holy Scripture, the language of which is associated with their purest religious feelings.

To us, Catholics, who know Latin there is a similar chain of associations in the language of our ritual, and much of their significance is lost if we translate the expressions into English. Thus the word "patria" in the *O Salutaris*, and "semper collaetemur" in the *Ave Maris Stella;* so also such expressions as "Domine Dominus Noster," "Quod tam sitio," "Talem ac tantum meruit habere Redemptorem," "Popule meus, quid feci tibi?" "Qui dormiunt in somno pacis," "Facie ad faciem," "Cor contritum quasi cinis," "Virgo virginum praeclara," "Rorate coeli desuper."

It is our misfortune that during the three hundred years in which the English language was making, it was in the hands of Protestants. It is this which prompts Cardinal Newman to say that English literature always will have been Protestant. Our best Catholic thought, even that which is literary in form, has been developed in alien speech, and does not readily adapt itself to English words under their present connotation. And consequently when Catholic truth is expressed, as it frequently is, in forms which bear the stamp "Made in France," or "Made in Italy," it loses half its attractiveness. Ours is then a difficult task. There are helps for us if we would only use them. The language

of the Elizabethan period, especially of Shakespeare, is not un-Catholic, and poetry can never entirely dissociate itself from Catholicism; while the Romantic movement of the present century, under the leadership of Sir Walter Scott, gives a Catholic ring to much of our finest literature. But many of our writers whose training did not fit them to use this inheritance, contented themselves with rendering into fairly readable English the results of Catholic thinking in other lands. In their works the charm of phrase is almost entirely lacking; and the thoughts rendered in precise forms have been so often given out to the people that they have lost their power of stimulating, and often produce little more emotional effect than the truths of the multiplication table. Every one who has made several retreats must have experienced the gradual decrease in power of excitation of the greatest truths of religion when presented on their objective side, and the demand on the part of our flagging attention to be stirred up by the personal power, original thought, and novel presentation of the preacher.

And if this be true of us in spite of all our good will and religious training, how much more is it true with the distracted and untrained minds of people in the world? St. Ambrose says, "Non in dialectica complacuit Deo salvum facere populum suum." And none of us can be long in touch with people before finding out that at the root of all popular religion is something more akin to poetry than dialectics. As Cardinal Newman says: "Logic makes but a sorry rhetoric with the multitude; first shoot round corners, and you may not despair of converting by a syllogism. . . . To most men argument makes the point in hand only more doubtful, and considerably less impressive. After all, man is *not* a reasoning animal; he is a seeing, feeling, contemplating, acting animal."[2] This holds good with almost all classes of men. Even converts from without rarely want what we consider proof; while to our own good people it is positively distasteful. They want us to know, indeed, and they are quick enough to perceive when a preacher does not know what he is talking about; but they do not wish him to try their patience by demonstrating what is to them the evident and refuting what to them is the absurd. It is hard to conceive of anything more likely to disturb the faith

[2] *Grammar of Assent*, p. 94.

of untrained minds than the presentation of the objections and refutations in a theological tract,—say on the Blessed Sacrament. Now none is less obliged to present truth in this way than the priests; and yet they above all seem most inclined to do so, at least while under the influence of their manuals of theology. Many priests with the certainty of truth in their souls, with a people hungry for religion before them, and with the wonderful authority of the Catholic Church behind them, will stop to distinguish and to define, to refute and to prove—and to prove what? Sometimes a truth that no person in the congregation had ever heard called into doubt before.

Argument has its place in a popular discourse, if the point in dispute be one of present interest, and the proofs advanced be adapted to the modes of thinking of the hearers. There is no argument for religion which appeals more to most men than to have an earnest man tell them, "Thus saith the Lord God, and I tell it to you, brethren, I who know." The Bishop of Clifton tells of an old Protestant friend of his who used to preach to the mining folk in Cornwall on hell by stating the truth strongly and then looking sadly at them saying, "It's all true, my dear people, all true." Or, to take an example which comes home to all of us. Nothing makes the unbeliever more angry than to read our creeds. They seem absurd to him, and he is irritated that seemingly reasonable people should believe it all. But we do not merely read our creeds—we sing them. The mystery of the Blessed Trinity seems full of difficulties to an outsider, and yet everyone has surely felt the distinct spiritual uplifting which comes when the Preface of the Trinity is sung. We do not want anyone then to come bothering us with his objections and proofs. We just want to be left alone to say: *O Beata Trinitas!*

Or, to take a moral truth. It is a common endeavor of preachers to show that it is better being good than bad; that the service of the devil is more exacting than the service of God. And yet what argument could ever bring this truth home to us so strongly as the powerful statement of personal belief made by Blessed Thomas More? He says: "So help me God, and none otherwise, but as I verily think that many a man buyeth hell with so much pain, that he might have heaven with less than the one-half."

It must be evident that there is in man a something which inclines him to belief, which all the wit and subtlety of exact theologians do not affect; that there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamed of in any philosophy. It may be necessary to repeat that there is no intention in all this to decry exactness in theology, or to assert that Christianity consists in a certain set of emotions. We all acknowledge that Christianity is a stupenduous fact, a body of compact truths, a strict rule of life; we know that a religion which lacks clearly stated dogmas lacks the principles of existence; and that mere pietism must perish of inanition. But the truth remains, that men are willing to accept Christianity, to live by it and to die for it, without cogent proofs of the fact, with a thousand difficulties concerning the truths, with aversion for many of the rules of conduct. They know that here is truth and goodness. It is the place where their hearts have chosen to rest. The side of Christianity which appeals most strongly to them cannot be expressed in accurate formulæ or clearest distinctions. True, their faith rests on, and is guaranteed by these formulæ and distinctions. Dogma is the soul of devotion, but it is not devotion itself. It is only when the truth expressed in the definition is brought home to the soul that it becomes a motive of action. It is not without reason that all the saints insist on the necessity of meditation.

Now this expressing of truth to elicit not merely intellectual assent, but also heartfelt consent, cannot be accomplished by openly scientific methods. This must strike the theologian when he addresses a popular audience. The methods and arguments which appeared cogent in the class-room are felt to be unsatisfactory in the pulpit and in the press. Reasons which he called "rationes convenientiæ" and flung out carelessly now become of primary importance. He shows how the truths of religion harmonize with the social and political needs of his hearers; how they are an ever-present help in time of temptation, and a consolation in hours of suffering; how they satisfy the thirst for ideal happiness which comes at times to the dullest of mankind; in a word, how every question is answered, and every longing fulfilled, and every need satisfied for human nature in the religion of Jesus Christ. And when he does this, he will be no more than honest, for he will be giving to others the aids by which his own faith finds pa-

tience and strength when his speculations end in seeming contradictions or in fag-ends of truth of which he cannot see the connection, in the "thousand difficulties which do not need to produce one doubt."

This paper is not intended to leave an impression that there has ever been any direct contention made even by the most narrow scholastic, that religion is a matter pertaining to pure reason. The question is largely one of practice, and in practice, of proportion, of less or more. This is a plea for more general recognition in our methods of approach to religious questions, and in our presentation of them, of the facts of psychology which our logical training seems to dispose us to overlook. The trained leaders of the Church should not have to leave the popular defence of its principles to converts, to laymen, even to unbelievers. This is not said in disparagement of our lay defenders. Their efforts deserve more appreciation than they sometimes receive. It is one of the most gratifying facts in our present status that almost every Catholic layman engaged in literary work in the English language is willing to use his talent in some way in defence of the faith.

These writers are doing a work that is good and necessary in presenting Catholic truth in a way that can be "understanded of the people." The least we can do is to equip ourselves to coöperate with them by our appreciation, our encouragement, and kindly criticism of their labors. We cannot assure ourselves that the next generation either of Catholic writers or readers will be like this one, and we must lay the foundation of Catholic culture while we may. Our people have earned by honest toil some repose for mental advancement, and the best among them are becoming interested in literature. They still possess the rugged faith of their fathers which measured all things by the standard of religion; but we cannot hope to preserve them in that happy state of mind unless we can supply them with reading matter which expresses Catholic ideas and Catholic ideals. It is work that must be done. It is ruin and shame for us if our people satisfy their mental hunger with husks and their thirst with lees, because the corn and wine are locked in inaccessible storehouses.

FRANCIS P. DUFFY.

Dunwoodie, N. Y.

AN OLD ABECEDARY ON THE DAY OF JUDGMENT.

THE hymn *Apparebit repentina Dies magna Domini* must be as old as the seventh century, for the Ven. Bede has a reference to it in his *De Metris*. Perhaps it dates even much farther back. It is given in many collections of Latin hymns, and has received some high praise. Daniel[1] compares it with the *Dies Irae*, the masterpiece of Judgment hymns, "quo maiestate et terroribus, non sancta simplicitate et fide superatur." The Rev. Dr. Neale remarks of it that "It manifestly contains the germ of the *Dies Irae*, to which, however inferior in lyric fervor and effect, it scarcely yields in devotion and simple realization of its subject." He styles it a "rugged, but grand Judgment Hymn."[2] Dean Trench[3] says that, although "wanting the high lyrical passion of the *Dies Irae*, yet it is of a very noble simplicity;" and quotes with approbation Daniel's appreciation.

Little need be said with respect to the text. The rhythm requires that *mendĭcum* (in the 27th line) should be mispronounced *mendīcum*. Trench corrects *praecingere* (in the 45th line) into *accingere*, apparently ignorant of the prayer, at vesting, for the cincture: "Praecinge me, Domine, cingulo puritatis," etc. *Ydri* (l. 43) stands for *Hydri*.

With respect to its content, it is, as Daniel declares, a "carmen fere totum e scriptura sacra depromptum." So true is this, that Trench complains of it as "too exclusively a working up of Scripture passages which relate to the last judgment, indeed we may say of one Scripture passage (Matt. 25: 31–46), in a narrative form."

Although it is styled by Dr. Neale an acrostic, it should rather be called, with technical accuracy, an "abecedary," since the initial letters of the couplets, taken consecutively, form not a word or a phrase, but simply the Latin alphabet. Perhaps in deference to the taste of Dr. Neale (who, although in general a felicitous translator of Latin hymns and sequences, makes no attempt to reproduce in his English version the alphabetic peculiarity of the original), Trench seems to throw some discredit on such a "con-

[1] *Thes. Hymn*, I, No. 161.
[2] *Med. Hymns and Seq.*, 3d Ed., p. 9.
[3] *Sac. Lat. Poetry*, 3d Ed., p. 296.

straint": "Latin hymns which have submitted to this constraint are," he says, "not very numerous; and there appears something artificial in an arrangement which, while it is a restraint and difficulty, confers few compensating benefits, and, when all is done, is rather for the eye than for the ear." The real "compensating benefit," it seems to us, is found in its appeal, not to either the eye or the ear, but to the memory. It is an old mnemonic device, and a valuable one; and although, because of the vast multiplication of books since the invention of printing, it has degenerated into a versifier's trick meant to please both eye and ear, it may very well be questioned if in its former application it ever addressed itself to either. Whatever value be assigned to the alphabetic device, we think that an attempt should be made to preserve it in any translation, if for no other reason, at least for its quaintness and comparative rarity. But the successful retention of this device should not be at the expense of the metre of the original. Especially should the original metre be preserved in the cases where (as in the *Dies Irae*, the *Stabat Mater*, and other such masterpieces) so much of the charm of the poem is due to its metrical and stanzaic structure.

There are in English three translations of the *Apparebit repentina Dies magna Domini*. Dr. Neale and Mrs. Charles (both of these being frequent and able translators from the Latin) have preserved the metre, but not the mnemonic device of the original. A third, Dr. Coles (a physician), has preserved the mnemonic but not the metrical form. If anything must be sacrificed, we think that, in this particular case, it should undoubtedly be the alphabetic form; for the metre in this hymn is the happiest possible echo of the sense. There is in it an overwhelming power like the mighty rushing of many waters, like the resistless and rapid flow of a torrent hurrying the reader on to that sudden precipice whose existence is foreknown but whose location is unsurmised—the *Dies magna Domini*. The metre must be retained at whatever cost.

In the trust that an English rendering which should retain both metre and alphabetic form was still a possibility, we have labored so to combine the results obtained by Dr. Neale and Dr. Coles as to supply the desideratum.

It will perhaps prove interesting to quote here some lines from each translator in illustration of the merits of each and of the method pursued in the attempted combination.

DR. NEALE'S VERSION.

Apparebit repentina
dies magna Domini ;
Fur obscura velut nocte
improvisos occupans.

That great Day of wrath and terror,
That last Day of woe and doom,
Like a thief that comes at midnight
On the sons of men shall come ;

Brevis totus tum parebit
prisci luxus saeculi,
Totum simul cum clarebit
praeterisse saeculum.

When the pride and pomp of ages
All shall utterly have passed,
And they stand in anguish, owning
That the end is here at last :

DR. COLES' VERSION.

Apparebit repentina
dies magna Domini ;
Fur obscura velut nocte
improvisos occupans.

As a thief in the night
when none waketh to ward,
Shall be the surprise
of that Day of the Lord ;

Brevis totus tum parebit
prisci luxus saeculi,
Totum simul cum clarebit
praeterisse saeculum.

Brief shall then seem
all its pomp and display
When the world shall have passed
and its fashion away.

For convenience in printing, we have broken up the long metre of the original and of Dr. Coles' rendering. It will have been noticed that Neale preserves the trochees of the original, while Coles changes them into anapests. Because of its particles or "hinges," English lends itself with ease to both iambic and anapestic verse, but only tardily and with difficulty to trochaic and dactylic. This is a common experience of versifiers. The version of Coles, departing entirely from the metre of the original, and using the much easier anapestic feet of English metre, is therefore quite flowing ; while that of Neale seems even more "rugged" (to use his own word describing the Latin) than the original. He succeeds much better, however, farther on ; and we have been able to incorporate about one-third of his version almost bodily into our own "compromise," which, without further preface, follows here.

HYMNUS DE DIE JUDICII.

Apparebit repentina Dies Magna Domini,
Fur obscura velut nocte improvisos occupans.

Brevis totus tum parebit prisci luxus saeculi,
Totum simul cum clarebit praeterisse saeculum.

Clangor tubae per quaternas terrae plagas concinens,
Vivos una mortuosque Christo ciet obviam.

De coelesti Judex arce, majestate fulgidus,
Claris angelorum choris comitatus aderit:

Erubescet orbis lunae, sol et obscurabitur,
Stella cadent pallescentes, mundi tremet ambitus;

Flamma ignis anteibit justi vultum Judicis,
Coelum, terras et profundi fluctus ponti devorans.

Gloriosus in sublimi Rex sedebit solio,
Angelorum tremebunda circumstabunt agmina.

Hujus omnes ad electi colligentur dexteram,
Pravi pavent a sinistris, haedi velut foetidi:

Ite, dicit Rex ad dextros, regnum coeli sumite,
Pater vobis quod paravit ante omnes saeculum;

Karitate qui fraterna me juvistis pauperem,
Caritatis nunc mercedem reportate divites.

Laeti dicent: Quando, Christe, pauperem te vidimus,
Te, Rex magne, vel egentem miserati juvimus?

Magnus illis dicet Judex: Cum juvistis pauperes,
Panem, domum, vestem dantes, me juvistis humiles.

Nec tardabit et sinistris loqui justus Arbiter:
In Gehennae, maledicti, flammas hinc discedite;

THE JUDGMENT DAY.

Awful in its sudden terror shall appear the Day of Doom:
Like a thief at midnight stealing on the thoughtless shall it come.

Brief shall then seem all the splendors of the ages that are past,
When the universe confesses that its end hath come at last!

Clangor of the mighty trumpet unto earth's four quarters spread,
Waxing loud and ever louder summoneth the quick and dead.

Dazzling from the height of heaven shall the awful Judge draw nigh,
Girt about with the angelic legionaries of the sky:

Eve's pale orb shall flush to crimson, and the sun shall hide its head,
And the stars shall fall from heaven, and the earth shall quake in dread:

Flame and fire and desolation at the Judge's feet shall go;
Earth and sea and all abysses shall his mighty sentence know.

Glorious the King of Heaven sitteth on his throne sublime,
While the very angels tremble, wholly innocent of crime!

His elect upon His right hand hath the Saviour shepherded;
But, like goats, the evil-doors on His left await in dread.

"**I**nto the eternal Kingdom, Blessed of my Father, come!
Ere were laid the world's foundations it was destined for your home.

Kindly succour, when I naked was and poor, ye gave to Me;
Now receive ye the exceeding great reward of Charity!"

"**L**ord," they cry in deep amazement, "when have we beheld Thee poor,
Or relieved Thee, King of glory, faint and hungry at our door?"

"**M**e it was ye helped and pitied," shall He answer: "Verily,
What unto the least my brethren gave ye, given was to Me!"

Next addressing all the wicked at His left, the Judge shall say:
"Go, ye cursed, to Gehenna, and the fire that is foraye!

Obsecrantem me audire despexistis mendicum,
Nudo vestem non dedistis, neglexistis languidum.

Peccatores dicent: Christe, quando te vel pauperem,
Te, Rex magne, vel infirmum contemnentes sprevimus?

Quibus contra Judex altus: Mendicanti quamdiu
Opem ferre despexistis, me sprevistis improbi.

Retro ruent tum injusti ignes in perpetuos,
Vermis quorum non morietur, flamma nec restinguitur:

Satan atro cum ministris quo tenetur carcere,
Fletus ubi mugitusque, strident omnes dentibus.

Tunc fideles ad coelestem sustollentur patriam,
Choros inter angelorum regni petent gaudia;

Urbis summae Hierusalem introibunt gloriam,
Vera lucis atque pacis in qua fulget visio,

XPM regem jam paterna claritate splendidum
Ubi celsa beatorum contemplantur agmina.

Ydri fraudes ergo cave, infirmantes subleva,
Aurum temne, fuge luxus, si vis astra petere;

Zona clara castitatis lumbos nunc praecingere;
In occursum Magni Regis fer ardentes lampades.

O how vainly I, a beggar, sought some pity for my lot—
Naked, ye have never clothed Me; sick, ye visited Me not!"

"**P**itied not?" they ask: "When didst Thou ever come to us forlorn,
Mighty King, or sick, or needy, and didst meet neglect and scorn?"

Questioned thus, the Judge replieth: "Since ye never cast your eyes
On the poor and sick and needy, it was Me ye did despise!"

Reeling backward at the sentence, to Gehenna they shall fly,
Where the flame is never ending, where the worm can never die:

Satan there and all his angels in profoundest dungeons bound,
Gnash their teeth and howl with anguish till the fiery deeps resound.

Then the righteous, upward soaring, to their Heavenly Country go,
Midst the cohorts of the angels, where is joy forevermo:

Ushered into all the splendors of the New Jerusalem,
Floods of light and peace and beauty shall alone encompass them:

Xrist shall they behold forever seated at the Father's hand,
As in Beatific Vision His elect before Him stand.

Ye who seek the heavenly Salem, from the dragon's malice fly;
Give your bread to feed the hungry, if ye seek to win the sky;

Zealously be girded round with zone of chastity all-bright,
And run forth to meet the Bridegroom coming, with your lamps alight!

H. T. HENRY.

Overbrook, Pa.

LUKE DELMEGE:—PART II. ILLUMINATION.[1]

XXXIX.—Martyrdom.

AS Luke Delmege returned home the following day, he was a prey to anguish and remorse such as rarely visit souls, except those who are called to the high planes of thought and trial. The sudden contrast between his own life, flawless and immaculate, but commonplace and unheroic, with the life of that humble priest, stripped of all things for Christ's sake; and the sharper contrast with the sublime heroism of this young girl, filled him with that poignant self-contempt which fine souls feel when they contemplate the lives of the Saints of God.

"I have been troubled with problems," he said. "Here is the great solution—Lose all to find all."

Even the great kindness of the Bishop, which augured great things for the future, could not dissipate the thought. Nay it intensified it.

"I have been in touch with great souls," he said. "Now, let me see can I be worthy of them. Can I see that great old man again without compunction; and that young saint without shame? Surely, heroism and heaven are for me, as for them!"

He commenced at once. Bit by bit, every superfluous article of furniture was secretly disposed of, until his bedroom became as bare as that old bedroom on his first mission, where he had sat and meditated in despair. And, except one or two articles, souvenirs of old friends, he denuded in like manner his little parlor, saving only his books. Then he begged for a cross. "Cut, burn, and destroy." He placed no limit to God's judgment. He asked for the unknown; and shut his eyes. And the cross came.

One morning he had a letter from Father Cussen saying that all preliminaries had been arranged; notices had been served on the Board of Guardians; and it was almost certain that the evictions in Lough and Ardavine would commence during the ensuing week. Furthermore, it was suspected that an example would be made of the leading Nationalists; and that, probably, Lisnalee

[1] *Copyrighted*, 1901, by the American Ecclesiastical Review.

would be visited first. A few days after, a second letter told him that the evil day had come. A company of soldiers had been drafted into the village, and the police were concentrating in a neighboring town. He made up his mind to leave that day and go to Seaview Cottage to await events. Whilst he was reading these letters he noticed that Mary was lingering in the room, under one pretext or another. She poked the grate assiduously, arranged and re-arranged the two vases several times, until at last Luke said:

"Well, Mary, what's up?"

Mary, trembling very much, faltered out:

"I was thinkin' to be afther asking your reverence to get another housekeeper!"

"Oh, you are anxious to leave me? I thought you were fairly happy here, Mary!"

"And so I was, your reverence," said Mary, biting the lace edging of her apron, and studying the pictures carefully.

"Then why are you leaving? Do you want higher wages?"

"Ah, 'tisn't that at all, your reverence," said Mary, with a frown.

"Well, surely you're not going to America with the rest?"

"Yerra, no! your reverence," said Mary, biting her apron more furiously.

"Well, I mustn't try to discover your secrets," said Luke. "You have your own ideas—"

"Yerra, 'tis the way I'm goin' to be married," blurted out Mary.

"Married?" cried Luke, aghast.

"Yes, your reverence! Why should not a poor girl get married if she gets the chance?" said Mary, with a pout.

"Oh, to be sure, to be sure," said Luke. "But I hope, my good girl, that you are making a wise choice. You deserve a good husband!"

"Indeed 'n he is a dacent boy enough," said Mary.

"He doesn't drink, I hope?" asked Luke, anxiously.

"Ah, not much, your reverence. No more than anybody else."

"Because you know, Mary," said Luke kindly, "that the

worst thing a young girl ever did is to marry a drunkard in the hope of reforming him."

"Ah, he's not as bad as that at all, your reverence," said Mary.

"Do I know him?" asked Luke.

"Yerra, you do, of course," said Mary blushing furiously.

"Does he belong to our parish?"

"Yerra, of course he does, your reverence," said Mary, with a little giggle.

"I won't ask you further—" said Luke, turning away.

"Yerra, 'tis John, your reverence," said Mary, now scarlet with confusion.

"John? what John?" said Luke.

"Yerra, *your* John, your reverence," said the poor girl.

"What! that ruffian!" cried Luke in dismay.

"Ah! he's not," said Mary pouting. "He's a dacent poor boy enough."

"Well, marriages are made in Heaven, I suppose," said Luke resignedly. "But I thought you and John were always quarrelling."

"Ah! we used make it up agin," said Mary.

"Of course you please yourself, Mary," said her master at length. "But it would be very embarrassing and awkward for me if you were to leave just now. I expect within the next few days my father and sister will be thrown upon the world; and they have no shelter but here!"

"Don't say another word, your reverence," said Mary. "If it was for seven years John must wait."

But John didn't see the force of this unnecessary procrastination. And there was another big row in the kitchen.

"An' you won't?" said John, as an ultimatum.

"I won't," said Mary, determinedly.

"Well, there's as good fish in the say as ever was caught," said John.

"Go, an' ketch 'em," said Mary.

But John relented after some hours' meditation.

"An' tisn't for your sake," he said, "but for the masther's It would be a quare thing if we wor to lave him in his trouble."

So Luke went down to Seaview Cottage to await events.

He had not long to wait. The following morning, as they sat at breakfast in the neat little parlor fronting the sea, there came to their ears a low, wailing sound, that appeared to be caught up and echoed by similar sounds here and there across the country.

"Some steamer going up the river!" said Father Martin. "That's the foghorn, and the echoes along the shores. Run out, Tony, and tell us what she's like."

Tony soon returned.

"There's no steamer in the channel," said Tony, "but the people are all running here and there up towards Ardavine."

"'Tis the signal of the eviction," said Luke, rising. "Let us go!"

"Sit down, man, and eat your breakfast," said Father Martin. "You have a long fast before you."

But Luke did not sit down again. The home of his childhood, the dream of the London streets, the vision that hovered ever before his eyes, even in his moments of unfaithfulness, was about to vanish in flame and smoke and red ruin. How could he sit down calmly and eat? He gulped down a cup of tea; and waited impatiently for Father Martin.

They drove up rapidly, to find that the terrible proceedings had already commenced. As they passed with difficulty through the vast, surging crowd, that swayed to and fro with excitement they saw the red dotted line of soldiers, who formed the cordon around the house; and within the cordon was the black square of police who were to guard the bailiffs from violence. The soldiers, standing at ease, gazed sullenly into the mouths of their rifles, never lifting their heads. It was dirty, unsoldierlike work, and they were ashamed. Their young officer turned his back on the whole dismal proceeding; and, lighting a cigarette, stared out over the landscape. The priests briefly saluted Father Cussen, who was trying by main strength of arm to keep back the infuriated people. He had barely time to whisper to Luke:

"I wish we had all your coolness to-day. There will be bad work; and we'll want it."

He struck the hand of a peasant lightly, as he spoke, and a large, jagged stone dropped on the ground.

Luke and Father Martin begged leave of the Resident Magistrate to approach the house and give such consolation as they might to the poor inmates. It was refused courteously. No one could pass inside the cordon. They stood on the outskirts, therefore, and watched the eviction,—Father Martin, anxious and sympathetic; Luke, pale with excitement, his eyes straining from their sockets, his face drawn tight as parchment. In dramas of this kind, alas! so frequent in Ireland, the evicted as a rule make a show of hostility and opposition to the law. Sometimes, the bailiffs are furiously attacked and their lives imperilled. When the keen, cruel hand of the mighty monster is laid upon them, the people cannot help striking back in terror and anger—it is so omnipotent and so remorseless. But, in this case, the beautiful faith and resignation to God's inscrutable will which had characterized the life of old Mike Delmege hitherto, and the gentle decency of his daughter and her husband, forbad such display. And so, when the bailiffs entered the cottage at Lisnalee to commence their dread work, they were met silently, and without the least show of opposition!

It was heart-rending to witness it—this same cold, callous precision of the law. The quiet disruption of the little household; the removal, bit by bit, of the furniture; the indifference with which the bailiffs flung out objects, consecrated by the memories of generations, and broke them and mutilated them, made this sensitive and impressionable people wild with anger. In every Irish farmer's house the appointments are as exactly identical as if all had been ordered, in some far-off time, from the same emporium, and under one invoice. And when the people saw the rough, deal chairs, the settle, the ware, the little pious pictures, the beds with their hangings, flung out in the field, each felt that his own turn had come, and that he suffered a personal and immediate injury. And Father Cussen had the greatest difficulty in restraining their angry passions from flaming up into riot, that would bring them into immediate and deadly conflict with the forces of the Crown. As yet, however, the inmates had not appeared. There was an interval of great suspense; and then Will McNamara, a splendid stalwart young farmer, came forth, the cradle of the youngest child in his arms. He was bleeding

from the forehead; and the people, divining what had taken place, raised a shout of anger and defiance, and rushed towards the house. The police moved up hastily, and Father Cussen beat back the people. But they surged to and fro, on the outer line of the cordon; and the young English officer threw away his cigarette, and drew in the long, thin line of the soldiers. In a few moments, Lizzie came forth, holding one child in her arms, and a younger to her breast. Following her was her husband again, still bleeding from the forehead, and with two frightened children clinging to him. Lastly, Mike Delmege appeared. The sight of the old man, so loved and respected in the parish, as he came forth from the dark framework of the cottage door, his white hair tossed wildly down on his face, and streaming on his neck, and his once stalwart frame bent and broken with sorrow, roused the people to absolute fury. They cursed deeply between their teeth, the women weeping hysterically; and a deep, low moan echoed far down the thick, dark masses that stretched along the road, and filled the ditches on either hand. For over two hundred years the Delmeges had owned Lisnalee—a grand race, with grand traditions of an unstained escutcheon and an unspotted name. And, now, as the last member of the honored family came forth, an outcast from his father's home, and stood on the threshold he should never cross again, it seemed as if the dread Angel of Ireland, the Fate that is ever pursuing her children, stood by him; and, in his person, drove out his kindred and his race. The old man stood for a moment hesitating. He then lifted his hands to God, and kneeling down he kissed reverentially the sacred threshold, over which generations of his dead had been taken, over which he had passed to his baptism, over which he had led his young trembling bride, over which he had followed her hallowed remains. It was worn and polished with the friction of the centuries; but so bitter a tear had never fallen on it before. Then, raising himself up to his full height, he kissed the lintel of the door, and then the two doorposts. He lingered still; he seemed loth to leave. And the bailiffs growing impatient, pushed him rudely forward. Weak and exhausted, the old man stumbled and fell. An angry scream broke from the people; and a few stones were flung. And Luke,

who had been watching the whole melancholy drama with a bursting heart, broke away from Father Martin, and forcing his way beyond the cordon of soldiers, he rushed towards the house, crying in a voice broken with sobs and emotion: "Father! Father!!"

As a river bursts through its dam, sweeping all before it, the crowd surged after him, breaking through every obstacle. The police, taken by surprise, fell away; but a young sub-inspector rode swiftly after Luke, and getting in front he wheeled around, and rudely striking the young priest across the breast with the broad flat of his naked sword, he shouted:

"Get back, sir! get back! We must maintain law and order here!"

For a moment Luke hesitated, his habitual self-restraint calculating all the consequences. Then a whirlwind of Celtic rage, all the greater for having been pent up so long, swept away every consideration of prudence; and with his strong hand tearing the weapon from the hands of the young officer, he smashed it into fragments across his knees, and flung them bloodstained from his own wounded fingers into the officer's face. At the same moment, a young girlish form burst from the crowd, and leaping lightly on the horse, she tore the young officer to the ground. It was Mona, the fisherman's sunny-haired child, now grown a young Amazon from her practice with the oar and helm, and the strong, kind, buffeting from winds and waves. The horse reared and pranced wildly. This saved the young officer's life. For the infuriated crowd were kept back for a moment. Then the soldiers and police charged up; and with baton and bayonet drove back the people to the shelter of the ditch. Here, safely entrenched, the latter sent a volley of stones flying over their assailants' heads, that drove them back to safe shelter. In the pause in the conflict the Resident Magistrate rode up and read the Riot Act.

"Now," he said, folding the paper coolly, and placing it in his pocket, "the first stone that is thrown, I shall order my men to fire."

It is quite possible, however, that the people would have disregarded the threat, so infuriated were they; but their attention was just then diverted by a tiny spurt of smoke that broke from

the thatch of Lisnalee Cottage. For a moment they thought it was an accident; but the smell of burning petroleum and the swift way in which the flames caught the whole roof and enveloped it in a sheet of fire, undeceived them. It was the irrevocable ultimatum of the landlord. It was the sowing with salt; the decree that never again should bread be broken, or eyelid closed on that hallowed spot. The solemnity of the tragedy hushed people, police, and soldiers into silence. Silently they watched the greedy flame eat up thatch and timber, and cast its refuse into a black, thick volume of smoke that rolled across the sea, which darkened beneath it. Then, there was a mighty crash as the heavy rafters fell in; a burst of smoke, and flame, and sparks; and the three gables, smoke-blackened, flame-scorched, stood gaping to the sky. Father Cussen took advantage of the momentary lull in the fierce passions of the people to induce them to disperse; but they doggedly stood their ground, and sent shout after shout of execration and hate after the departing bailiffs and their escort. And as they watched the latter moving in steady, military formation down the white road, a strange apparition burst on their sight. Across the valley, where the road wound round by copse and plantation, a carriage was seen furiously driven towards them. The coachman drove the victoria from a back seat. In the front was a strange and imposing figure, that swayed to and fro with the motion of the carriage, yet kept himself erect in an attitude of dignity, and even majesty. His long, white hair, yellowed and almost golden, was swept back upon his shoulders by the land breeze; and a white beard, forked and parted, floated and fell to his waist. He held his hand aloft with a gesture of warning. With the other he clutched the carriage rail. The priests and people were bewildered as they stared at the apparition. Some said it was the landlord; for they had never seen that gentleman; and with the eternal hope of the Irish, they thought he might have relented, and was coming to stop the eviction, and reinstate the tenants. Some thought it was supernatural; and that the great God had intervened at the last moment, and sent them a Moses. But they were not disappointed, nay, a great light shone over their faces, when, on cresting the hill, the Canon's coachman was recognized, and by degrees the

old familiar face of power and dignity beamed on them. There was a mighty shout of welcome, that made the soldiers pause and turn backward. The people, mad with delight, and a new sense of hope and protection from the presence of their mighty patriarch, crowded around the carriage, kissed his hands, knelt for his blessing, told him that if he had been in time, Lisnalee would have been saved, etc., etc. Slowly, the carriage forced its way through the thick masses that surged around it. The old man saw nothing. His eyes were straining out to where the peaked burnt gables cut the sky. Then, when he came in full view of the horror and desolation—the broken household furniture, the smoking ruin, the evicted family, lingering in misery around their wrecked habitation, saw the old man bending over his grandchild in the cradle, and the wound on the forehead of its father, he groaned aloud, and with a despairing cry, "*My people! oh! my people!!*" he fell back helpless in his carriage, and covered his face with his hands.

A few days after, Luke Delmege received a summons to appear before a special court that was to sit in the Petty Sessions room at Ardavine, to answer to a charge of obstructing the police in the discharge of their duty, assaulting a police officer, etc.

In the afternoon of that day of trial Barbara Wilson was summoned to the parlor of the Good Shepherd Convent. The Sister who summoned her took her young charge gaily by the hand and led her wondering and trembling along the nuns' corridor to the large reception-room in front of the Convent. With a bright, cheery word she ushered Barbara into the parlor and closed the door. There were two in the room—the Bishop and the Mother Provincial. The former, advancing, placed a chair for Barbara and bade her be seated. Barbara sat, her hands meekly folded in her lap, not daring to lift her eyes, but filled with a sweet emotion of mingled apprehension and hope. She knew that the crisis of her life had come. The Bishop looked at her keenly and said:

"Miss Wilson, the secret of your sojourn here in the character of a penitent is known. You cannot remain here any longer!"

"My Lord!" she said, trembling, "I have been very happy here. Could you not let me remain?"

"Quite impossible," said the Bishop. "In fact, I am not quite sure that the whole thing has not been irregular from the beginning. You must now resume your proper station in life."

"I am very helpless and quite unfit for the world, my Lord," said Barbara, (the dream and its realization seemed now totally dispelled); "what can I turn to now, especially as my past is known?"

"Oh, you can easily assume your proper place in society," said the Bishop. "You are young, life is before you, and you may be very happy yet."

"My Lord," said Barbara, weeping, "if it is happiness I seek, I shall never know such happiness again as I have experienced here. But I know all now. I was murmuring against my cross and dreaming of other things, and now God has taken away my cross and my happiness for ever. O, Mother, dear Mother, plead for me, and let me go back again!"

"Impossible, child," said Mother Provincial, but with a tone that brought Barbara to her knees in a moment. She buried her face in the Mother's lap, crying passionately:

"Oh, Mother, you can, you can. Keep me here. I'll do anything, anything you like; but don't send me out into the world, the dreadful world, again. Oh, my Lord," she cried, "I saw things once that I never care to see again—one dreadful night when I lost poor Louis in London, and sought him up and down for hours. And, oh, I found heaven here, and I didn't know it. And God is punishing me dreadfully. Oh, Lord, dear Lord, give me back my cross, and I promise never, never again to repine or revolt against it!"

The thought of facing the great, hard, bitter world had never occurred to her before, until now when the door of her happy home was opened and she was bade depart. All the nervous fear of an inexperienced soul and all the horror of one which has been *in* the world but not *of* it, combined to fill her with a strange dread, which became almost hysterical. In her great agony her white cap fell, releasing the long, rich tresses that now flowed down, tossed and dishevelled, and swept the ground. And the Bishop thought, that if the picture could be transferred to canvas it would make a "Magdalen" such as no painter had ever

dreamed before. But he remonstrated, reasoned, argued, pleaded, what would the world say? what would even good Catholics think? what reflections would be cast upon the Church, her discipline, her teaching, etc.? But the silent, prostrate figure made no reply. And the Bishop went over to study carefully a picture of the Good Shepherd which he had seen a hundred times, and to blow his nose violently.

After an interval, Mother Provincial said, looking down on Barbara, and smoothing her long, fine hair:

"My Lord, I think there is one condition on which we could keep Miss Wilson here."

Barbara lifted her face. The Bishop turned round rapidly.

"What is it?" he said, without a trace of dignity, and with very red eyes.

"If Miss Wilson would care to change this dress," said Mother Provincial, touching the blue mantella, "for the habit of the Good Shepherd——"

"Oh! Mother, Mother! there's my dream, my dream!" cried Barbara, in a paroxysm of surprise and delight. "Oh, Lord, dearest, sweetest Lord, how good art Thou, and how wicked and unbelieving have I been! Oh, my Lord!" she cried, turning to the Bishop with clasped hands, "there was hardly a night in which I did not dream I was a Sister of the Good Shepherd; and I thought our dear Lord Himself clothed me with His wounded hands, and I used even touch the gaping wounds with my fingers, as He said: 'Arise, and come; the winter is past!' But oh! the agony of waking and finding it was all a dream. And then I used reproach myself with being unfaithful to my vow; and I used pray, but oh! with such a faltering heart, 'I have chosen, I *have* chosen, to be an abject in the house of my Lord!' And now, here is my dream realized. Oh! Mother, I shall never, never distrust my dear God again!"

"Very well, Mother," said the Bishop, trying to steady his voice. "There's one clear sign of a vocation whatever, that this young lady has been thinking of your white habit so long. Now, can she make her novitiate here?"

"I think not, my Lord," said the Mother Provincial; "I shall send her to Cork for many reasons."

"Well, then, the sooner the better, I presume," said the Bishop. "There's a train at 5.20. Will the young lady have time to change her dress in that time? Very well, my carriage will be at the convent door at a quarter to five o'clock. And, as I have some business to transact in Cork, I shall have the honor of escorting Miss Wilson to her new home."

"Mother," said Barbara, "I'm stupid with delight. Can I say good-bye to my—to the penitents?"

"No!" said the Mother, "you must enter on your obedience at once!"

"Not even to poor Laura, Mother?"

"Well, yes! when you have changed your dress," said Mother Provincial, with some hesitation.

It was a happy parting, that between Barbara and the soul she had saved; for it was only for a time. And it was a happy little soul that moved down amongst the lilies and azaleas of the nuns' corridor, escorted by Sister Eulalie, who whispered:

"If only Luke was here now, how happy he would be!"

And out from behind doors and recesses, and flower-pedestals, rushed ever and again some white-robed figure, who flung her arms silently around the young postulant, silently kissed her on the face and mouth, and silently vanished. And as she rolled along in the Bishop's carriage, she thought:

"To see uncle and father now would be Heaven. But no! not till I am clothed. Then they'll see me, and rejoice. Oh! how good is God!"

As they entered the Cork train, there emerged from a train that had just run in on the opposite platform, a strange procession. First came a detachment of police, with rifles, and full equipments; then a batch of poor peasants and laborers, evidently prisoners; then a young girl, with a plaid shawl around her head; then a priest with his arm in a sling. Barbara caught her breath, and could not forbear saying aloud:

"That's Father Delmege, my Lord!"

"So it is!" said the Bishop, who had been watching intently. "Take your seat, whilst I go and see him."

And so, as Barbara passed from her martyrdom rejoicing, Luke entered on his.

He had been duly arraigned before the constituted tribunals of the land, and had taken his place in court. He would gladly have gone into the dock with his fellow-prisoners, but the law, always polite and courteous and inexorable, would not allow it. It was a wonder that he was not invited on the bench to try himself. When the magistrates entered, all present uncovered their heads but the prisoners. They wished to protest against law, and legislators, and executive alike.

"Take off your hats," shouted the police angrily.

The prisoners refused, and one of the constables roughly seizing one of the young men, dashed his hat furiously on the ground.

"Remove your hats, boys," said Luke, from the place he occupied near the Bench. "Respect yourselves, if you cannot respect the Court."

The young men doffed their hats immediately. It was almost pitiful—this little protest of defiance; pitiful, by reason of its very impotence.

The Court proceeded to try the cases with calm, equable formality, each case being individually handled to show complete impartiality. Every one in court understood that the conviction was a foregone conclusion. But everything should be done regularly and in form; though every prisoner felt the merciless grasp of the law upon him. And so the proceedings moved steadily on to their conclusion, like well-oiled machinery, smooth, harmonious, regular, irresistible. The magistrates consulted for a few minutes and then announced their decisions. The poor peasants and laborers were sentenced to terms of imprisonment varying from three to six months, but always accompanied with hard labor. When Mona's turn came, she was sentenced to six months' imprisonment without hard labor. She stood in the front of the dock, looking calmly and defiantly at the Bench. Her eyes alone blazed contempt and determination.

"I want no favors from ye," she cried, as her sentence was announced. "Ye are the enemies of me creed and country."

"In consideration of your sex and youth, we dispense you from hard labor," said the presiding magistrate, "although your offence was a most serious one, and might have imperilled the life of the officer—"

"He struck a coward's blow," said Mona, "an' it was right that a woman's hand should chastise him."

The magistrates were passing on to the next prisoner, when she again interrupted:

"Will ye gi' me the hard labor?" she said. "No wan shall ever say that I showed the white feather."

"Then we change your sentence to three months and hard labor," said the magistrate.

"Thank ye," she said, pulling the shawl again over her face.

"We have taken into account, Mr. Delmege," continued the magistrate courteously, "your position, and the excellent character you have hitherto maintained. We also take into account that in one sense the grave assault of which you were guilty, and which might have led to lamentable consequences, was possibly owing to the great excitement that unhappily accompanies the operations of the law in this country. We, therefore, are of opinion that the requirements of the law and justice shall be satisfied by asking you to enter into your own recognizances to observe the peace for twelve months."

Luke rose, pale and weak. His right hand was badly swollen; and he still was in danger of blood-poisoning.

"I am sure, gentlemen," he said, "you do not intend it; but I can hardly regard your decision as other than an insult. There has been nothing alleged in my favor to extenuate the offence, or mitigate the severity of the law. I am more guilty than these poor fellows, and that poor girl. If there be any reason for clemency, let it be extended to her. She has an aged father, and a sick sister at home—"

"No, Father Luke," said Mona. "I want no mercy from the government of England. I'll go to gaol with more joy than I'd go to me wedding; an' God and His Blessed Mother will look afther Moira and father."

"It is an extremely painful duty, but we are unwilling to proceed to extremities in such a case. If you can see your way, Mr. Delmege, to accept our decision, I assure you it will give us great pleasure," said the magistrate.

"Once more, gentlemen, I appeal to your clemency on behalf of this poor girl," said Luke. "Prison life is not suitable for the young——"

"Don't demane yerself and me, yer reverence, by askin' pity from thim," said Mona, with flashing eyes. "Sure, we're only goin' where all the haroes of our race wint before us."

"Once more, Mr. Delmege," said the magistrate, "will you enter on your own recognizances——"

"Impossible, gentlemen," said Luke, sitting down.

"Then it is our painful duty to direct that you be imprisoned for three calendar months from this date, and without hard labor."

"And so you're a prisoner?" said the Bishop, after he had blessed the crowd of kneeling prisoners, and given his ring to little Mona to be kissed. "I expected it. Take care of that nasty wound in your hand. I hope the doctor will send you straight to the infirmary."

"Don't fill my vacancy, my Lord," said Luke, "at least till I return. My father has no other shelter now."

"Never fear," said the Bishop. "I'll send a temporary substitute, with special instructions to Dr. Keatinge."

"Thank you, my Lord," said Luke.

"Well, good-bye! We'll see you sometimes in your hermitage. By the way, do you know who's accompanying me to Cork?"

"No, my Lord," said Luke, wonderingly.

"You might have heard of Miss Wilson, the niece of Canon Murray?"

"To be sure, I know her well," said Luke eagerly.

"She has had a strange history; but I'll tell you some other time. These fellows are growing impatient. She is about to commence her novitiate as a postulant of the Good Shepherd in Cork."

"Oh, thank God!" said Luke, so fervently that the Bishop wondered exceedingly.

XL.—Reunion.

"Sorrow gives the accolade!" Yes. The blow is sharp, but the quickening is very great. It was just what Luke wanted. All great souls covet pain; and Luke's was a great soul, though he was unconscious of it, and though he had been striving to stifle

during all his life his sublime aspirations and to sacrifice them on the modern altar of mere commonplace and respectability. Circumstances, or rather the Supreme Mind that guides circumstances, had now brought him face to face with suffering and even shame, and he exulted. For if there is a glory in the prison and a sunlight on the scaffold, nevertheless the very thought of personal restraint and the sense of loss of man's highest prerogative, liberty, bring with them a deep humiliation, and the sharp knighthood of the sword is forgotten for a moment in the vulgar grasp of the gaoler. Then comes the reaction, and the sense of exultation; and the keen embrace of pain has a quickening and vivifying power over soul and nerves not yet strained and unstrung by selfishness.

Then, again, Luke found he was an object of respectful solicitude to all around him. The doctor instantly placed him in the infirmary. The right hand was swollen to a dangerous extent, and it was only after the lapse of some weeks that the dangerous symptoms subsided.

"If that hand shall ever get hurt again," said the doctor, "I won't answer for his life."

These days were days of depression for Luke—or moments of depression in hours of deep thought. Left completely to himself, his mind ran over the events of his life in detail. There was little with which he could reproach himself. Yet he was unsatisfied. Then, from time to time, odd phrases that had fastened on his memory would come up at most unexpected times and plague him with their persistency. His verdict on Barbara Wilson ten years ago in the Schweizer-Hof:

"She's not a mortal; she's a spirit and a symbol—the symbol of the suffering and heroism of my race," came up again and again, doubly emphasized now by all he had heard and seen of her years of renunciation and suffering. And his thoughts passed over from the symbol to the symbolized, and the strange expressions used by so many priests about Ireland surged back upon his memory.

"What would the Jews have been if they had not rejected Christ?"

"We have to create our own civilization; we cannot borrow that of other countries."

"We are the teachers of the world; not the pupils of its vulgarity and selfishness."

One night, in the early weeks of his imprisonment, he lay awake in pain, tossing from side to side in great agony. His mind was unusually active, and the sudden thought seized him to sketch a visionary future for his country, founded on this ideal of simplicity and self-renunciation. As his thoughts worked onwards and built up this airy commonwealth of Christ the pain was completely forgotten, and he fell asleep early in the morning. The doctor found his temperature much higher on his morning call, yet he declared him somewhat better.

"Doctor, I want something badly," said Luke. "Can I have it?"

"By all means," said the doctor. "What is it?"

"Pen, ink, and plenty of foolscap paper," said Luke.

"Not yet," said the doctor. "I presume you have not yet learned to write with your toes."

It was so much the better, because Luke had time to think and develop his ideas more fully before he committed them to paper.

Then the pain and sacrifice met with their immediate reward. There was no demonstration on his return from prison. He was an unknown factor in politics. Even in Rossmore there was no ovation. It was felt that he was above such things. But during his imprisonment every kindness and attention was lavished on his father and sister and her children, who had become his guests in his little home. And the same silent, gentle sympathy flowed around him when he returned. Mary wept hysterically, and kissed his hands passionately; and wept still more when she saw his face drawn and pale from much suffering. John said:

"Bad luck to the government and the landlords! Wondher they left him out alive!"

Every kind of shy, pathetic question was put to him by this sympathetic people; every kind of gentle, unobtrusive benevolence was shown him. They could not presume too far upon the grave, silent man; but they spoke their mute love and admiration in a hundred ways. Yet, things were a little tightened in econom-

ical matters, sometimes. Will McNamara had gone to America; but the father and Lizzie and the children were there. And children must have bread, and meat, and clothes, too. Nature says so, and must not be denied.

One day Luke was walking down the village street in his silent, abstracted way, when he heard a voice challenging him, and rather defiantly:

"What's the matther wid me mate, yer reverence?"

He turned round and came face to face with the village butcher, Joe Morrissey. Joe seemed to be angry. There had been for a long time a certain want of sympathy between Joe and the "Coadjutor." Joe was a Nationalist, and an extreme one. He had been out in '67; had cut the telegraph wires between the junction and Limerick; and had been one of the last to part from the young Irishman who gave up his life gallantly for his country in the woods near Shraharla. And he had taken it as granted that this polished, well-dressed young priest, who was always preaching the virtues of the Anglo-Saxon, their thrift, punctuality, etc., and consequently emphasizing the defects of his own countrymen, could not be a Nationalist or a patriot. His opinions changed a little after the sermon on Cremona, and had now completely veered round after the scene at the eviction, and the subsequent knighthood of the gaol.

"I beg your pardon, Mr. Morrissey," said Luke, humbly, for life's events had made him very humble.

"I want to know, your reverence," said Joe, slapping his broad knife across the palm of his hand, "what's the matther wid *my* mate, that you're reflectin' on it?"

"I'm sure I'm quite unconscious, Mr. Morrissey," said Luke, quite puzzled, "of having said anything derogatory—"

"Look at that for mate," said Joe, unheeding, and slapping with the knife the joints that hung in the open window. "Is there the likes of that in the County Limbrick? Look at that for lane, red and juicy; and that fat, rich and cramey; and what's a poor man to do, when his clergy, and the heads of his Church—"

"Don't mind him, your reverence," said Mrs. Morrissey, coming out, and wiping away with her check apron the tears that were streaming down her face, "he doesn't mane what he says, yer reverence—"

"Will ye hould yer tongue, 'uman," said Joe, angrily, "can't you let me talk, whin a gintleman comes into the shop. I say, yer reverence, 'tis a shame that our clergy should be turnin' their backs on their dacent parishioners, and sindin' for their mate to Limbrick and elsewhere, whilst—"

"Never mind him agin, yer reverence," interposed Mrs. Morrissey, still weeping, "what he manes is, that every Saturday, wid God's blessin' for the future, a leg and a line (loin) will go down to you; and, sure, sometime or other, you can pay us. And sure if you never did, God is good!"

Joe had gone out in his indignation; and was looking up and down the street in a very determined manner. Luke came out; and was about to express his gratitude when Joe stopped him.

"There's jest wan favor I want to ask yer reverence," he said.

"To be sure, Mr. Morrissey, if I can possibly grant it," said Luke in wonder.

"Oh, begor, you can," said Joe cheerfully. "Since I was the height of that," he said, stooping down, and putting his open palm within six inches of the ground, "no one ever called me anything but Joe. Me father called me Joe; me mother called me Joe; me brothers and sisters called me Joe. The priests called me Joe; the schoolmasther called me Joe, whin he didn't call me: You d—d ruffian! Whin I grew up, and got married me wife called me Joe; and whin God sint the childre, wan by wan, begor! they never called me anything but Joe. The youngster inside in the cradle knows me as well as yer reverence; and, faix he never calls me "daddy," but Joe. And to tell you the truth, yer reverence, when you call me Misther Morrissey, I don't know who you're talking to. Would it make any difference to your reverence to call me Joe like all the nabors?"

"Certainly not, Mr.—Joe," said Luke, deeply touched, and stretching out his hand. "God bless you!"

"'Tis dirty," said Joe, hastily rubbing his hand on his breeches, "but 'tis the hand of an honest man."

And Joe had the reward of his generosity. It came quickly, and in its most attractive form. That is, the little incident gave

him the opportunity—the dearest that can fall to the lot of an Irishman in this world—of making a good joke. And so, when he sat that evening on the leaden ledge of his open window, and lit his pipe, he was a happy man.

"Begor," he said to the group that always surrounded his establishment, "'tis the best thing that occurred for many a long day. 'Mind the pinnies,' sez he, 'an' the poun's will take care of themselves.' Ha! ha! ha! 'Look out for a rainy day,' sez he, 'an' make hay while the sun shines.' Ha! ha! ha! ha! Begor! the poor man wint to a bad schoolmaster, whin he began to tache himself. For faix, he hasn't even a butchin pinny to bless himself wid."

"How could he have it," said a bystander; "whin he gives it to this, that and the other wan. Begor, the Bank of England wouldn'd sthand it."

"Look here, hones' man," said Joe Morrissey, taking the pipe out of his mouth, "that's all right; and 'tisn't me as is goin' to find fault with him. But, what did he want talkin' to us about savin' money, whin he wasn't savin' it himself; and all about English ways, whin the man has an Irish heart, no matter how he consales it? That's what kills me. Sure, the ould sayn' is thrue—Do what the priests tell ye; but don't do what the priests do therselves."

So public opinion surged around Luke in these days of trial. For now Lizzie and her little children had to go away. The strong, brave young farmer had got a job in the docks of New York, and had paid their passage. And with breaking hearts on both sides they parted with all they held dear on earth, and exchanged the free, pure air, the sweet waters, the rushing winds, the rustling trees, the murmuring seas, and freedom and happiness, for a flat in a tenement house in the great city, and the fever and fret of a new life. Ah me! will it ever cease—this dread transformation in lives that were never created but for the sweetness and purity, the silence and the holiness of simple rural environments? And one day old Mike Delmege, "heart-broke afther the little childre'," bowed his head, and was gathered unto his fathers.

Then there came a great void in Luke's life. He shrank ever

more and more into himself, and without being in the least degree moody or reserved, he detached himself from all human things, and wrought in simple earnest love towards the Divine. But the few ties which circumstances had created for him—spiritual ties that grew all the stronger by reason of their unworldliness—drew him from time to time from his hermitage, and maintained for him that perfect poise between the world and God, which would otherwise have been broken by a morose asceticism, or a too great leaning over to the creature. And so he kept up a constant and mutually edifying correspondence and intercourse with Father Tracey and Father Martin, and, sometimes, he found himself in a closer and more intimate friendship with his Bishop than he had ever dreamed of.

And one day he found himself the happy intermediary in a little scene in the Canon's drawing-room, which seemed to him a beautiful and divinely-appointed *denoûement* in the little drama in which he had been not always a successful actor.

The good Canon had had a relapse after the exciting scene at the eviction, and had sunk into a condition of extreme helplessness. One side was hopelessly paralyzed; and he had to be wheeled from room to room in a bath-chair. The tolerant legislation of the Irish Church reflects strongly the charitable bias of the people's minds; and allows an aged pastor, "who has borne the burden of the day and the heat," and who is disqualified for further work, to retain his parish and presbytery to the end in sturdy independence. And it was very beautiful and edifying to see the broken and enfeebled giant, rolled in and out to his little church, where he spent the greater part of his declining days. The little children used fight for the honor of rolling back across the gravelled walk their aged pastor. They had lost all fear of him now, even of the great snowy beard that swept down on his breast. And still the people came to consult him in their troubles; and to talk of the golden age that had been. And so, calmly and peaceably, his days glided on to the great sea, over which he looked without fear, or terror, or misgiving. One thing only troubled this calm evening of life—the mystery that hung around his beloved niece. Her strange history had been carefully concealed from him, until all should be ripe for the revelation.

He was dozing calmly one summer afternoon when Luke was announced. The latter had often called to exchange ideas with his old pastor, and to relieve the monotony of his illness. He was not surprised, therefore, only deeply pleased at the announcement.

"Ha, my dear young friend," he said, "you caught me—ha—napping. Take a chair and sit with me for a while. Somehow, old times seem to have come back most vividly this—ha—afternoon."

He was silent for a while, his mind busily gathering up the broken threads of the past. Luke sought to divert his attention by telling of his own experiences.

"My sister and her husband are doing well in New York," he said, "I have had a letter lately, asking had any one taken Lisnalee."

"That is not very likely," said the Canon. "Lisnalee remains a monument, and for ever—well, we must not be resentful. But—the events of that—ha—miserable day had one good effect. The horror has not—ha—been repeated; but the people are anxious, frightened, dispirited. They know not when the evil spirit will come again."

"Yes," said Luke mournfully, "the golden age of my poor parish is passed for ever."

"Yet," he said, brightening up, "the world is not all a hopeless place and helpless, or life altogether an insoluble problem."

"You have heard—ha—something that might excite your hopes and ha—sympathies?"

"Yes, sir," said Luke. "I have heard something that deeply concerns me, and——"

"I hope my conjecture is correct," said the Canon, listlessly; "and that his Lordship has yielded to my repeated—ha—solicitations; and, consulting for your unique circumstances, advanced you to a—ha—benefice."

"It is not quite that, sir," said Luke, feeling his way nervously. For now the drawing-room door was opened as gently as if only the summer breeze had stolen in and touched it with a light finger. "It is a something that, if you will pardon me, may also concern you."

Luke was never so nervous before, not even in his first student visit to that dread presbytery. He thought the great clock on the mantelpiece quite impertinent in its noisy ticking.

"Alas!" said the old man, feebly, "very little concerns me now, except the one great event. I did think, indeed—perhaps you will esteem it—ha—a harmless vanity—that the Bishop might have—well—offered me the Archdiaconate before I died. But that was not to be. That was not to be!"

"The diocese thought he would have done so," said Luke, watching the door intently; "but the Bishop looks mostly to the young. He would, however, have given any honor to our old friend, Father Tracey, I believe; but that great saint will have none of these things."

"I haven't always agreed with that excellent, but—ha—rather eccentric clergyman," said the Canon; "but I daresay he is right—quite right!"

"What I am referring to, however, sir," said Luke, now in a state of desperation, "is something that concerns you even more deeply—something that has been the thought and dream of your life."

The old man seemed sunk in a kind of stupor; but something in Luke's words seemed to wake him up to a new life, for he started and asked in an excited whisper:

"Barbara?"

It was the question he had been asking for twelve weary years. He now dreaded to hear again the eternal answer—No! And his face pleaded eloquently against it.

"You know something?" he said. And Luke said, Yes!

"It is a strange coincidence," said the Canon, his face lighted up with a new emotion, "that just as you were announced this afternoon I was dreaming of Barbara. I suppose it is senile weakness, or the mental debility arising from my condition; but in a half-dose I thought I—ah—saw my dear niece entering just as long ago; she used—ha—sweep into this drawing-room with such easy grace and dignity. Ah me! these were happy days, did we but know it. But you were about to say—ha—my dear young friend, that you had some news from Barbara. There is that—ha—singular delusion again. I fear, my young friend, that my intel-

lect is becoming weak. It's a singular delusion; but now I think, of course, it is only an hallucination, that there in that doorway—ha—what—my God!——"

Ah, yes! dear old soul, this time there was no delusion; for a figure of light did stand in the dark framework of the door, clothed all in white, save a tiny thread of blue; and that figure of light did tremble all over under the sweet tremulous dread of shocking with too sudden bliss the frail old man. But now there was no time for further concealment, and with a little glad cry of delight and pain, Barbara, clothed now in the white, beautiful habit of the Good Shepherd Nuns, was at her uncle's feet, and was kissing his two withered hands passionately amid her tears. Luke had done his part well, and had quietly gone out, leaving uncle and niece together. He went down to the old hut by the seashore to visit his old friends, to say a kind word to poor Moira, who was wasting away slowly in consumption, and to exchange the account of his prison experiences with Mona, his fellow-martyr. When he returned to the drawing-room Barbara still sat at her uncle's feet; the old man, with a look of rapture on his face, was toying with her white scapulary, and murmuring something that sounded like *Sans tache!*

Ah yes! Spotless and immaculate, and with all the purity of a fire-tried soul, she had passed under the mighty yoke of Christ, who had put His own stole of suffering around her. But, strange to say, though now enrolled in the glorious band of virgins, who follow the Lamb wherever He goeth, and sing the canticles none other can sing, there were hours and days when the thought haunted her with a sense of pain and fear, that perhaps after all the day of trial was sweeter than that of victory, and that, like Alexis of old, it would have been better, or more glorious, to have died a reputed Magdalen. For saintly souls, like this, are ambitious. They want the highest and the noblest. The martyrdom must continue to the last breath; nor do they care to yield up their souls but in a sigh of pain, and the agony of dereliction. But then, here too, the Supreme Law, God's Will, was manifested; and beneath it she sheltered herself when regrets for the lost nobility of perpetual pain reproached her. And hence, when in the ecstasy of this reunion, which was the one

thing that nature demanded, the thought recurred: Would it have been better otherwise; or if this meeting with the beloved one had only taken place on the far, eternal shore? she brushed aside the thought as a temptation, and gambolled around the dear old presbytery as a child. And she showed her companion-sister all the wonders of the place—the dairy, where she had—indeed she had—made butter; and the poultry—the same old, identical Orpingtons and Dorkings which had won so many prizes for dear uncle; the flower-beds, alas! now not so neat and perfect as when her gentle hands had tended them. And "here," she said, "Father Delmege stood, leaning on that mantlepiece, the evening he sang that fierce, rebel song; and I, a giddy young girl, raced after him down that footh-path, that runs to the gate, and begged him to look after Louis in England! Ah, poor Louis! if he were only here now."

And the happy Barbara wiped away a tear with her plain cotton handkerchief. And then, after tea, these birds should shake out all too prematurely their wings in the great clock, and the deep gong toll out, like a bell of doom, the hour of six—and then—the parting, as of all things else on earth; for Luke had to drive the nuns to the evening train for Limerick, where they would get one night's lodging before going back to the novitiate.

THE MORAL ASPECT OF BRIBERY IN A COURT OF LAW.

IN his *Casus Conscientiae*, Vol. II, cas. 2, P. Gury writes: "Judex minime retinere potest munera accepta ad sententiam justam ferendam, quia hoc non potest esse materia contractus, utpote pretio non aestimabile. Potest autem *probabiliter* servare munera accepta ad sententiam injustam ferendam, post factum, ut dictum est *de Contr. in genere*, ubi de contractu in materia turpi." This is the only solution one can logically reach if one takes the view that the case in question is to be dealt with like ordinary cases in *materia turpi*. But surely we have here a *reductio ad absurdum* of that view. If a judge cannot keep the bribe tendered to him for giving a just decision, because the act of giving a just decision is not *pretio aestimabile*, then the opinion that a judge may retain

the bribe received for giving an unjust decision—according to those who hold this to be probable—must rest on the assumption that to give an unjust decision is *pretio aestimabile*. Now, what is the difference between the act of the judge in giving a just decision and the act of the judge in giving an unjust decision? What is there in the one that it should be *pretio aestimabile* and in the other that it should not? Physically, the act is the same in both cases. If, then, the rendering of a just decision, in so far forth as it is a physical act, is not to be bought with a price, neither is the rendering of the unjust decision, viewed as a physical act, valid matter of sale. We must, therefore, seek the reason why a price may be taken for the one and not for the other in the moral difference between the two acts. And the judge has no conceivable title to the money he takes from the man who bribes him but the naked and infamous fact that his decision is consciously unjust. There is here no room for the distinction between the act as sinful and the act as serviceable or laborious. For, (1) the act of the judge in giving the just decision is equally serviceable and laborious; and, (2) in so far forth as his act in giving any kind of decision is serviceable or laborious, it is not his to sell, seeing that his labors and services as judge were already hired out to the State from the day that he was sworn into office. It remains that the iniquity of his act is the only title he has to get a price for it. The least that can be said of the view that leads by direct logic to so monstrous a conclusion, is that there is not left about it even one poor shred of probability.

Nor may it be urged, as some moralists do urge, that though the act of the judge is not his to sell so far as it is laborious or serviceable, it is his to sell so far as it involves risk of loss or disgrace. For, to begin with, the fact of a thing being disgraceful affords but a very questionable title to getting a price for it. If honor is not to be bought or sold, neither should dishonor be reckoned a marketable commodity. The risk of temporal loss in the transaction is a more plausible ground on which to set up a claim for compensation. But the risk of loss, as well as the risk of disgrace, spring directly from the injustice of the decision, and are inseparably bound up with it. Both the one and the other are the direct fruits of the injustice; and if injustice as such is not *pretio aestimabile*, neither are its fruits.

The opinion that a judge may keep the bribe he gets for an unjust decision was proscribed by the Bishops of France in 1700.[1] Both St. Augustine and St. Thomas reject it: the one explicitly, the other by necessary implication. The words of the former are: "The fact that an advocate may be feed for pleading a just cause, and a lawyer for giving trustworthy counsel, is no reason why a judge should take a price for giving a just decision, or a witness for testifying to the truth. For these are employed to decide the case between the litigants, while those act for one only of the parties to the suit. But if it is wrong to sell a just decision or true testimony, much more criminal is it to take money for an unjust decision or false testimony, seeing that it is a crime even for those who give it with a will."[2]

In the *Summa*, St. Thomas lays down this general principle: "That cannot be due matter of sale of which the seller is not the owner."[3] Now, as has been pointed out, the judge is not the owner of the decision he gives in court—even were we to grant it to be *pretio aestimabile*—since he does but act there for the State as the dispenser of justice. Again, the Saint says—I quote from the excellent English rendering of the Second Part of the *Summa* by Father Rickaby, S.J.: "There are three sorts of ill-gotten goods. . . . There is another sort which the party who has gotten it cannot keep, and yet it is not due to him of whom he has gotten it: because against justice he received it, and against justice the other gave it; as in the case of simony, in which both giver and receiver act against the justice of the divine law. Hence restitution should not be made to the giver, but the amount should be distributed in alms. And the same in like cases, in which both giver and receiver act against the justice of

[1] I make this statement on the authority of P. Paul Gabriel Antoine, S.J., who so testifies in his treatise, *De Obligationibus Specialibus*,—reproduced in Migne's *Theologiae Cursus Completus*, Parisiis, 1862; vol. 16, p. 1255.

[2] "Sed non ideo debet judex vendere justum judicium, aut testis verum testimonium, quia vendit advocatus justum patrocinium et jurisperitus verum consilium: illi enim inter utramque partem ad examen adhibentur; isti ex una parte consistunt. Cum autem judicia et testimonia, quae nec justa et vera vendenda sunt, iniqua et falsa venduntur, multo sceleratius utique pecunia sumitur, quia scelerate etiam quamvis a volentibus datur."—*Epistola 153, ad Macedonium*, n. 23.

[3] 2ª 2ae, q. 32, a. 7.

the divine law. Hence restitution should not be made to the giver, but the amount should be distributed in alms. And the same in like cases, in which both giving and receiving are against the law."[4] That the case of the judge is one of "like cases" which the Saint would have us solve in the same way, will hardly be gainsaid.

Truth and knowledge, like honor and virtue, have not of themselves a money price. Yet a lawyer may justly take a price for his pleading or counsel. The reason is, as St. Thomas points out, that, though legal knowledge is a spiritual gift, use of it is made by bodily work; and, on the other hand, a lawyer is not always bound to plead or give advice in other men's causes. Therefore, says the Saint, he "may justly take a fee for services that he is not bound to render."[5] There is thus, in this respect, a twofold difference between the lawyer and the judge. The latter is under contract with the State to render such services as may be required in dispensing even-handed justice. He is therefore bound by a prior obligation to render these services, and cannot take a fee from the parties to the suit. Again, while the legal knowledge he draws upon is his own, and *pretio aestimabile* in so far as use is made of it by bodily work, it is in him wholly subservient to the authority by which he renders the decisions. And this authority he holds, not as a personal right and private possession, but as a something bestowed on him by the State for a specified purpose. Hence, even though he were not at all under contract to render these services, he could not take a fee for them from private parties, because they are bound up with that judicial authority which is his, indeed, to exercise for the good of society, not his to use in his own behoof—not his to sell the use, and, least of all, the shameful abuse of, for a price.

A judge, therefore, cannot keep the bribe he takes for giving an unjust decision. Can a lawyer keep the fee he gets for defending an unjust cause? This case belongs to the class of cases *in materia turpi* in which it is the act that is wrong, and not the giving or taking a price for it. The question has been dealt with at some length, though only incidentally, in a former article.[6]

[4] *Aquinas Ethicus*, Vol. I, p. 388; 2ª 2ae, q. 32, a. 7.

[5] 2ª 2ae, q. 71, a. 4.

[6] AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, August, 1901, pp. 132–136.

But as there are those who strongly maintain that the price received for service of this sort can in no case be kept,[7] it may be well to go more fully into the matter. As appears from a citation made in that former article, St. Thomas decides this question absolutely in the affirmative. Another citation to the same purpose may be given here. "There is a third sort of ill-gotten gains, where the getting itself is not unlawful, but the source of the getting is unlawful, as appears in the case of what a woman gets by following the trade of a prostitute. This is properly called *filthy lucre;* for in following that trade the woman acts filthily and against the law of God: but in taking her hire, she acts not unjustly, nor against the law. Hence this manner of ill-gotten gain may be retained."[8] This is properly called "filthy lucre" (*turpe lucrum*), not only because it is gotten filthily and disgracefully, but also because it is lucre or *gain*. In the case of the other two kinds of ill-gotten goods spoken of by the Saint, that which is gotten is not gain at all, for it cannot be kept. What the thief gets by stealing, to give an instance of the one kind, is not gain, but must be given back to the one from whom it was stolen. Neither is it gain what the judge gets for an unjust decision, to give an instance of the other kind, but it is forfeit to society, against which the wrong is done.

Like all bargains between private individuals, the contract of buying and selling is regulated by commutative justice on the principle of equality of thing to thing. The objective elements of it are: (1) a thing *pretio aestimabile*, of which the seller is the owner; (2) money or other commodity belonging to the buyer; (3) a certain equality between the two. Given these three, we have all that is objectively essential to a valid sale under the law of nature. Now, in the ordinary cases of *contractus turpis*, we certainly have all three of the objective or material elements. Thus, a lawyer's defence of an unjust cause is *pretio aestimabile*, and his services are his own to dispose of for a price; the fee he gets is his client's to dispose of; and there is a certain equality between the fee and the service rendered. The only difficulty is

[7] Cf. *De Pactis et Contractibus*, G. de Beusch, S.J., apud Migne, op. cit., *Theologiae Cursus Completus*, nn. 269–280.

[8] *Aquinas Ethicus*, Vol. I, p. 388.

in respect of the formal element, which consists in or at least presupposes the mutual consent of the parties. And the difficulty is this: Every valid contract begets an obligation in conscience. But how can one bind oneself in conscience to do what is wrong? Can there be a moral obligation to commit sin? Assuredly not; the thing is absurd, monstrous. How then can the contract be valid if it does not beget an obligation in conscience? Or, can mere lapse of time or change of circumstances make that valid which is void from the first? This is the real knot of the difficulty, and so intricate that it might seem as if there were no way to solve it.

Let us take the concrete case that we are dealing with. A lawyer agrees to plead a cause that he knows to be unjust. The trial over, he gets his fee. What title has he got to it? He has the title of services rendered. From the contract? Yes. Was that contract valid? Before answering that question, we must make certain distinctions. Premising that a valid contract is one that begets the effects that are proper to it, we must distinguish between the contract in the making, so to say, and the complete contract. The agreement to sell for a price, before it is completed by the transfer of the thing, or at least of the *jus in re*, is a promise of sale, and a necessary preliminary to selling, rather than a sale. As such it begets an absolute obligation in the seller to deliver the goods, and in the buyer a conditional obligation to pay the price—conditional, that is, on the goods being delivered. Of course this conditional obligation does not exist in act; in other words, is no obligation at all, until the condition is fulfilled. Hence the only effect the agreement in question can have is an obligation in the seller to do what he has promised. And it is valid or void according as it does or does not beget this obligation. In the case we are treating of, it does not beget the obligation, and therefore is void. But at this preliminary stage of the transaction we have not as yet the contract of buying and selling at all. A promise to sell is not a sale, and does not beget the effects of a sale, any more than a promise of marriage is marriage or begets the effects of marriage. Nor is the conditional promise to pay a price an actual purchase. Even when the price is given at the outset, the buyer retains his title to it or its equivalent until the seller performs his part of the contract. As, then, a

promise of marriage may be void and the subsequent marriage valid, so the promise of sale may be void and the subsequent sale valid.

Some one will perhaps demur to this reasoning on the ground that there is no parity between the two cases. It may be urged that the subsequent marriage is valid in virtue of a new consent *de praesenti* given by the parties, and that there is no such consent in the other case. True; but there is something that perfects the contract not the less effectually. Contract differs in kind from contract; and each kind is perfected after its own way. A promise of marriage is perfected and becomes valid when it begets its proper effect, which is a mutual obligation in the parties to contract a marriage; and a promise of sale is perfected when it begets the effect proper to it, that is to say, an absolute obligation in the one party to deliver the goods or perform the stipulated service, and a conditional obligation in the other to pay the price. Similarly, a marriage is perfected when there is an exchange of mutual rights as promised, and a sale when the party of the first part does what he has engaged to do and the party of the second part becomes bound in conscience and in justice to do likewise. Now, the very essence of marriage, as distinguished from the promise of marriage, consists in the mutual consent *de praesenti* of the parties, and a valid marriage, therefore, there never can be without such consent. The essence of sale, on the other hand, consists in the actual delivery of the goods, or at least of the legal title to the goods. The contract is perfected by deeds, not words. Supposing therefore a promise to have preceded, a valid sale is effected, in such a case as the one we are considering, where the matter of the contract is a service, by the actual rendering of the service, without further formality of any sort. For by the mere rendering of the service, and from the moment that it is rendered, the one party does what he has engaged to do and the other becomes bound in justice to pay him the price.

It may still be objected that what he has engaged to do in the case we are contemplating is wrong, and the antecedent promise invalid; accordingly, that though the subsequent sale is validly effected by the simple performance of the service in cases where such performance is lawful, it is not so in this case. To this

it is replied that if the validity of the subsequent contract depended absolutely upon that of the antecedent promise, then of course the sale would be null and void. But it does not. For, (1) it does not in the case of marriage; and the parity holds, as has been shown. And (2) the sale is valid, not in virtue of the promise which begets the obligation to perform the service, but in virtue of the performance of that service. It is not in virtue of the promise but in virtue of the performance that there arises in the other party the obligation of paying the price. No one would be willing to pay his money for promises as such, or could be under any sort of obligation to do so. It is only when the service is rendered that a person "absolutely transfers the thing that is his to another, to receive compensation in something else," according to St. Thomas' definition of *buying and selling*.[9] The antecedent agreement defines, but does not beget the obligation of paying the price.

The truth of what has thus far been said may be placed in a yet clearer light by a fuller consideration of the instructive parallel between the contract of marriage and the contract of buying and selling. A promise of marriage between a Protestant and a Catholic, for instance, is void; but the marriage is valid. A promise of marriage between father and daughter, or between a man and a married woman, is void, and the marriage void also. In like manner, a promise to sell a service that is unlawful but of its nature salable, is void; but the subsequent sale is valid. A promise to sell that which is not only unlawful but of its nature unsalable, as the decision of a judge, or that of which the seller is not the owner, as the services of a judge on the bench, is void by the law of nature, and the subsequent sale is void by the same law. In the first set of parallel cases, the promise is void from an extrinsic cause only, and the subsequent contract is, though unlawful, absolutely valid. In the second set of parallel cases, the promise is intrinsically void, and the subsequent contract void in the same way. It is an act falling on undue matter: the contract lacks the essential elements that the law of nature requires for its validity. In the former case, the immorality of the action is extrinsic and does not affect its essential nature; in the latter, it is intrinsic, and thus radically vitiates and voids the

[9] *Aquinas Ethicus*, Vol. II, p. 25.

contract. The services of a judge on the bench never can be bought or sold; in this matter every attempt at buying or selling is not only banned by the law of nature, but also made void of all effect. The services of a lawyer in an unjust cause, tried by the standard of moral rectitude, are absolutely wrong and unlawful; but, measured by the rule of commutative justice, are found to be valid matter of sale. And so long as the matter of the contract squares with this rule, the sale is to be accounted valid, however much the conscience of the seller may have swerved from the eternal standard of right and wrong.

ALEX. MACDONALD, D.D.

Antigonish, N. S., Canada.

DR. JOHN HOGAN, S.S.

THE last day of September brought the sad tidings from Saint-Sulpice, Paris, that Father Hogan, the venerable teacher of generations of worthy priests, was dead.

When, in 1884, he was called to the presidency of St. John's Seminary, Boston, he was fifty-five years of age.[1] From that time until his departure for France last summer his whole energy had been devoted to advancing the intellectual standard of the clergy in the United States, and we are convinced that generations of churchmen will reap rich fruits of his activity in the field of clerical education. His lectures to ecclesiastical students and young priests, chiefly of the Boston archdiocese, were replete with interesting and useful information, and bore the impress of that mellow wisdom which is ever the result of thoughtful experience. For more than thirty years he had been engaged in the work of training candidates for the priesthood. At the age of only twenty-

[1] Father John Hogan was born June 24 (feast of St. John the Baptist, from whom he received his name), 1829, in Bodyke, County Clare, Diocese of Killaloe, Ireland. In 1843 he was sent to college at Bordeaux, France. Three years later (1846) he entered the Society of Saint-Sulpice in that city, and completed the regular theological course at the age of twenty-one. Being too young for ordination, he was sent to Paris in order to take a post-graduate course at Saint-Sulpice. Later on he went to Issy to prepare for ordination, and at the age of twenty-three was raised to the priesthood, in Paris, where death overtook him.

three he was appointed to the chair of Fundamental Moral Theology, and this at Saint-Sulpice, Paris, where some of the brightest lights of France were then attending, either as professors or as pupils. Later, the chair of Fundamental Dogma was assigned him; then, that of Higher Dogma; and during the nineteen or twenty years before his call to the United States he taught Higher Moral Theology. This made him one of the most discerning judges in difficult cases of conscience; and we have heard one of his pupils, the present Bishop of Tarbes, say that the clergy of Paris regarded the Abbé Hogan as one of the first theologians of present-day France.

His lectures covered the whole range of ecclesiastical studies. The general culture which he had acquired in his studies and intercourse with nearly all the leading personages in the ecclesiastical circles of France gave to his ordinary talks a singular charm, which showed to advantage the synthetic mind building up its themes in scholastic order and neglecting no element that may be needful or useful in the process of demonstration. It was not his habit to write. He spoke from notes containing the points of his argument and suggesting illustrations for its application. Indeed, we deem it one of our proudest successes in establishing a permanent staff of contributors for the REVIEW, that we should have been the first to call forth from Dr. Hogan the exercise of his ability as a writer.

Up to the year 1890 Dr. Hogan had not written for the magazines or published any work that might indicate the immense treasury of ecclesiastical knowledge to which he held the key. During that year he had given a series of conferences at Overbrook Seminary which led us to urge him to bring to paper his views on the study of ascetic theology. "I cannot do it," he said; "it requires a habit of exact and detailed registering of one's thoughts which I have never cultivated." He objected too on the score of having a multiplicity of engagements which drew him into active life, away from the leisured seclusion which is necessary to the serious writer. The following year we repeated our request, giving an indication of the good that might be effected by a systematic exposition of the work our priests are expected to do under conditions widely different in many respects

from those upon which the theological text-books and the Latin methods introduced into our seminaries were based. He realized the reasonableness of our plea and showed some signs of willingness to undertake such work, as the following letter, dated January 12, 1891, intimates:

MY DEAR DR. HEUSER: In your last letter there was a manner of appeal to which I should have given a more prompt reply. But at that time I was busy with other things. And then, whilst desirous to meet your wishes, I did not well see how I could do it. No more do I now; though anxious to be helpful. I just feel in a general way that, besides the questions of the day, there are many others of permanent interest—in Dogmatic and Moral Theology, Biblical Studies, etc., which I have been led to look into and which might prove welcome and beneficial to your clerical readers. If you think it worth while, you might make me some suggestions. . . .

To this we replied at once, renewing our argument and outlining a programme that might entice him to use his pen. A week later we received the following letter:

DEAR DR. HEUSER: You could not have suggested a subject more attractive to me than the one you mentioned. In fact I would be tempted to extend it to the branches of study comprised in our seminary programmes—Philosophy, Natural Sciences, Biblical Studies, etc.

I think there is room for practical remarks on all. But this is no small task, and I should not like to do it too hurriedly.

Meanwhile I have called to mind and just looked over the earlier portion of a course I gave in Brighton a couple of years ago. Though suggested largely by what I had been reading and hearing for years, I think there is much in it that would be new and interesting to your readers. I send you the notes by this mail, that you may judge for yourself, if you could spare an hour to look into them.

I would conceive of a series of articles entitled Studies on the Gospel. There might be six or seven papers, such as: The Gospel and Speculative Doctrine; The Gospel Law of Life as contrasted with Judaism and Paganism; The Gospel and Secular Morality; The Methods of Teaching; The Obscurities of the Gospel, etc., etc.

If the thing does not suit the purpose, or needs to be altered substantially, please tell me and return MS. when you have looked into it. . . .

The reader will notice the delicacy and reserve with which Dr. Hogan, who had for more than thirty years held a leadership in the intellectual circles of Catholic France, approached his work of writing for the clergy. "I am glad to know that my little paper meets your wishes," he wrote two months later when he had sent his first article, entitled "The Curriculum of Clerical

Studies," which appeared in the May number of that year.[2] The remaining numbers of the series followed in pretty regular order. The MS. was always carefully written out by himself, and required hardly any revision before being put into the hands of the printer. He was as careful in his literary expression as if he had been under academic censorship all his life; and this care was only equalled by the large-minded deference he paid to the judgment of others. "It was kind of you," he writes in one of his early letters (April 11, 1891), "but unnecessary, to acknowledge without delay the receipt of my second paper. I should have accompanied it with a request to improve in any way you think proper this and any other article I may send you. If there happened to be—though it could hardly happen—anything I would not commit myself to, I would see it time enough in the proofs . . . As for the time to publish these papers I leave the matter entirely to your own judgment." He confined himself almost invariably within the allotted space, so that we knew in advance where to place his paper. Speaking of one of the articles on the Study of Philosophy which was published during the following year he writes: "In the present article I have been somewhat longer than usual—yet not I hope to the extent of deserving the reproach I made to others.[3] I trust I have not to make the opposite confession, *Brevis esse laboro: obscuro fio.*"

While keenly alive to the defects of a system, the weakness of an argument, or the danger of an over-zealous defence of any position, he knew how to separate his critical judgment from all personal feeling. At the time when the differences of view among leaders of public opinion regarding Catholic education and certain theological questions were very pronounced, and led to invective and suspicion in high places, Dr. Hogan expressed to us his own views very frankly, although he knew that we differed from him in some respects. But when the question became one of personal relations, he at once distinguished an

[2] In the volume, *Clerical Studies*, in which this series was afterwards republished, the paper has been in part incorporated in the Preface.

[3] In an earlier letter he had commented on the style of some writer in the REVIEW who had seemed to him to obscure a good argument by the abundance of his words.

opponent's moral value from his intellectual standard. Speaking of one whom he knew intimately and who had drawn upon himself promiscuous criticism for some public utterance at an inopportune time, he wrote: "In connection with . . . let me ask you not to judge him—or anybody else—unfavorably on hearsay. *All my life I have been witnessing men deeply wronged by judgments based on incorrect reports of their teachings.* . . . The doctrinal part of the question is settled; what remains open must be left free to all."

In August of 1898 the series of *Clerical Studies* was completed. It had run through thirty-seven numbers. The work of seven years was revised and published in book form. In the meantime it was being translated into French by the Abbé Boudinhon. In sending the MS. of the last article of this series Dr. Hogan wrote: "Though the last of the series, I trust it will not be the last from me in the REVIEW. I have learned to feel at home there, and you have been always so encouraging that when tempted I shall have no hesitation to return."

It is needless to say that we did not fail to tempt the Abbé. Later in the same year an article from his pen on Seminary and University Studies appeared in the REVIEW. In November Dr. Hogan writes: "You have all you want. Yet the thought has come to me recently whether there would not be room for a series of papers on Religious Art, from a practical standpoint and for the purpose of leading priests to learn something of the æsthetic as well as the practical side of the work they have to order and watch in the matter of the building, repairing, decorating, and furnishing their churches, chapels, sacristies, etc." It is of this series that we give in our present issue of the REVIEW the last instalment which Father Hogan was able to send us. He expected to complete the series and do more. In December of 1898 he had written:

DEAR FR. HEUSER: By this mail I send you the promised article. If you think it should be followed by others, I shall be expecting suggestions from you as to what you would consider most interesting or most practical.

At my period of life I feel more than ever the sense of the exhortation—"Dum tempus habemus operemur bonum."

It was in this sense that he spoke to us last summer, hopeful,

after a severe spell of illness, that he would yet be able to write. God had ordained otherwise; and before he had expected it rest has come to him. He labored indeed for good while the time was given him. Ma he possess the reward exceeding rich. We owe him gratitude for many things—his labors in behalf of the REVIEW, his friendship, and counsel. Not the least that remains to us is his encouraging, kindly memory as a priest who fostered learning and piety among those over whom he was placed. The words written on the tomb of a famous teacher (Busbey) have come to us as applicable to him:

"Is erat
Qui adolescentium animos
Ita docendo finxit aluitque
Ut tam sapere discerent quam fari;
Dumque juvenes instituebantur
Honesti succrescerent viri
Quotquot illius disciplina penitus imbuti
In publicum prodiere
Tot adepta est Ecclesia
Tot Respublica Propugnatores."

EDITOR.

Analecta.

E S. CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM.

I.

DE CONSENSU ORDINARII REQUISITO AD EXERCENDAM FACULTATEM BENEDICENDI CORONAS, CRUCES, ETC., CUM APPLICATIONE INDULGENTIARUM APOSTOLICARUM ET S. BIRGITTAE.

Cum in Rescriptis S. Congregationis Indulgent. vel in Brevibus Apostolicis etc., quibus tribuitur facultas benedicendi Coronas, Rosaria, Cruces, Crucifixos, parvas Statuas ac Numismata, eisdemque Indulgentias Apostolicas et S. Birgittae adnectendi, clausula apponatur "*de consensu Ordinarii loci;*" circa sensum huius clausulae non semel dubitatum est; hinc Praepositus generalis Clericorum Regularium Infirmis Ministrantium circa eiusdem clausulae intelligentiam sequentia dubia huic S. Congregationi solvenda proponit:

I. *Utrum huiusmodi consensus ita necessarius retineri debeat, ut, si desit, Indulgentiae sint omnino invalidae?*

Et quatenus affirmative:

II. *A quonam Ordinario huiusmodi consensus dari debeat?*

III. *Et si utens hac facultate Romae commoretur, ubi facultas benedicendi exerceri nequit, sufficeretne consensus Emi Urbis Vicarii*

aut Vicesgerentis ad benedicendum, an ab alio extra Urbem Ordinario, et a quonam, foret exquirendus?

Et Emi Patres in Vaticano Palatio coadunati die 11 Iunii 1901, propositis dubiis responderunt:

Ad I^um^. *Detur instructio.*

Instructio.

" 1°. Convenit ut qui facultatem benedicendi Coronas, Cruces, Rosaria, Numismata etc., cum applicatione Indulgentiarum Apostolicarum et S. Birgittae obtinere cupit, si sit e clero saeculari, litteris commendatitiis proprii Ordinarii munitum supplicem libellum exhibeat, si vero sit regularis, Superioris sui Ordinis vel Instituti a S. Sede approbati.

" 2°. Ut valide praefata facultas exerceatur opus erit, ut Sacerdos ad excipiendas Sacramentales Confessiones, saltem virorum, sit approbatus.

" 3°. Ad eam facultatem licite exercendam requiritur consensus Ordinarii loci in quo quis ea uti velit, firmo manente, quoad regulares exemptos, decreto huius S. C. diei 8 Iunii 1888. Hic autem consensus optandum ut sit expressus; sufficit tamen etiam tacitus vel implicitus, et in aliquo casu, quando practice aliter fieri nequeat, sufficit etiam consensus prudenter praesumptus."

Ad II^um^. et III^um^. *Provisum in I°.*

Et SS.mus Dnus Noster Leo Papa XIII in audientia habita die 14 Iunii 1901 ab infrascripto Cardinali Praefecto resolutiones Emorum Patrum ratas habuit et confirmavit.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria eiusdem S. Congregationis die 14 Iunii 1901.

S. *Card.* Cretoni, *Praefectus.*

L. ✝ S.

✝ Franciscus Sogaro, *Archiep. Amiden., Secretarius.*

II.

De precibus piisque exercitiis indulgentiis iam ditatis ad sacramentalem poenitentiam explendam impositis.

Supremus Moderator Fratrum S. Vincentii a Paulo huic Sac. Congregationi Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae hu-

militer exponit saepe Confessarios, quo melius spirituali poenitentium utilitati consulant, preces vel pia exercitia indulgentiis ditata in sacramentali confessione imponere, existimantes uno eodemque actu datum esse poenitentibus sacramentali poenitentiae satisfacere et adnexas precibus vel piis exercitiis indulgentias lucrari. Verum quoad huiusmodi opinionem et praxim non levis sententiarum disparitas exorta est, eo quod nonnulli, innixi Decreto huius S. C. diei 29 Maii 1841, quo negatur posse per preces iam obligatorias, v. gr. per horas canonicas, satisfieri precibus a Summo Pontifice praescriptis ad lucrandam indulgentiam, contendunt omne prorsus fundamentum praedictae opinioni et praxi Confessariorum esse sublatum; e contra alii affirmant laudatum Decretum ad rem non facere; in eo siquidem agitur de una vel altera conditione ad lucrandam indulgentiam imposita, non vero de precibus vel piis exercitiis, quae auctoritate Summi Pontificis indulgentias iam secum ferunt, et assumi possunt tanquam Sacramentalis poenitentia, nisi aliter mens concedentis declaraverit.

Ut itaque omnis ambigendi ratio de medio tollatur, sequens dubium solvendum proponit:

Utrum poenitens precem aut pium opus indulgentiis ditatum explens, possit simul et poenitentiae satisfacere et indulgentias lucrari?

Et E.mi Patres in Congregatione Generali ad Vaticanum habita dei 11 Iunii 1901 rescripserunt:

Affirmative, facto verbo cum SS.mo.

Quam quidem resolutionem, in audientia habita ab infrascripto Cardinali Praefecto die 14 Iunii 1901 relatam, Sanctitas Sua benigne confirmavit.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria eiusdem S. Congregationis die 15 Iunii 1901.

S. *Card.* Cretoni, *Praefectus.*

L. † S.

† Franciscus Sogaro, *Archiep. Amiden., Secretarius.*

III.

Sanatio pro Confraternitate B. M. Virg. de Monte Carmelo.

B.me Pater:

P. Praepositus Generalis Carmelitarum Discalceatorum ad

sacrorum pedum osculum provolutus exponit S. V. non raro contingere ut Christifideles, qui ad Confraternitatem B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo admitti postulant, invalide recipiantur, tum ob omissam nominum inscriptionem, tum ob aliam causam. Ne itaque praefati Christifideles gratiis et privilegiis memoratae Confraternitati concessis inculpatim priventur, Orator S. V. humiliter exorat, quatenus receptiones ad eamdem Confraternitatem, quacumque ex causa, usque ad hanc diem invalide peractas benigne sanare dignetur.

S. C. Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita, utendo facultatibus a SS. D. N. Leone Pp. XIII sibi specialiter tributis, petitam sanationem, ad effectum de quo agitur, benigne concessit. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Rome ex Secria ejusdem S. Congregationis die 3 Iulii 1901.

S. *Card.* CRETONI, *Praefectus.*

L. † S.

† FRANCISCUS SOGARO, *Archiep. Amiden., Secretarius.*

IV.

INDULGENTIA PRO JACULATORIA "LAUS, HONOR ET GLORIA CORDI DIVINO JESU."

SS.mus D.nus N.r Leo Pp. XIII in Audientia habita die 14 Iunii 1901 ab inf.pto Card. Praefecto S. Cong.nis Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae, omnibus ex utroque sexu Christifidelibus praefatam iaculatoriam (*Louange, honneur et gloire au Divin Cœur de Jesus*) precem corde saltem contrito ac devote recitantibus, Indulgentiam *quinquaginta* dierum, semel in die lucrandam, defunctis quoque applicabilem benigne concessit. Praesenti in perpetuum valituro absque Brevis expeditione. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria eiusdem S. Congregationis die 14 Iunii 1901.

S. *Card.* CRETONI, *Praefectus.*

L. † S.

† FRANCISCUS SOGARO, *Archiep. Amiden., Secretarius.*

Conferences.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proposes to answer in this department questions of general (not merely local or personal) interest to the Clergy. Questions suitable for publication, when addressed to the editor, receive attention in due turn, but in no case do we pledge ourselves to reply to all queries, either in print or by letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

S. CONGREGATION OF INDULGENCES:

1. Issues an Instruction relative to the authority required for using the faculty of blessing beads, crosses, etc., to which the Apostolic and Brigetine Indulgences are attached.
2. Decides that indulgenced prayers and exercises imposed as sacramental penances entitle the performer to the gain of the indulgences.
3. Declares valid by a *sanatio* the admission of members to the Confraternity of Mt. Carmel which for any cause was deemed invalid.
4. Attaches an Indulgence of fifty days to the ejaculatory prayer *Praise, honor and glory to the Divine Heart of Jesus.*

ST. THOMAS AND COMMUNION OFFERED FOR THE DECEASED.

Qu. An article which appeared two years ago in *La Rosaire et les autres Devotions Dominicaines* has been causing lively discussion among the Canadian clergy ever since. The author, Fr. Gonthier, O.P., inveighs against the custom of offering Holy Communion for the deceased, as is the practice, especially during the month of November, with many of the faithful. The principal reasons cited by the writer against a view commonly sustained by confessors and preachers throughout the Church, are: first, that the reception of Holy Communion is not an act that can be applied meritoriously for the benefit of others; secondly, that the practice, whilst of no avail

to the souls of the deceased, largely discourages the ancient usage of the faithful to have Masses said for the benefit of their departed friends.

I send you the article in question, "La Communion pour les morts," in which St. Thomas is quoted as authority for the above-mentioned plea. Whether or not the passages from the Angelic Doctor are correctly interpreted I do not venture to say; but in a French edition of the *Summa* which I have before me I find the following: "C'est avec raison que Rome a condamné de son autorité suprême la doctrine de Theophile Renaud que la communion pour les morts est une erreur populaire et une fraude pieuse."[1] Again in the same chapter: "Mais quand le fidèle reçoit dignement le corps du Seigneur, il exerce une œuvre qui lui appertient en propre, l'œuvre la plus sublime, la plus excellente et la plus meritoire que puisse produire l'activité humaine jointe à l'activité divine; il a d'ailleurs préparé l'habitation de son âme par les rudes travaux de la contrition, de la confession et de la satisfaction. Eh bien, le mérite de tous ces actes, il peut l'appliquer à ses frères par mode de suffrage; il le peut en vertu de la communion des saints que nous professons dans le symbole des Apôtres; il le peut surtout au divin banquet, lorsque la grâce et la charité rendent ses prières plus ferventes, et que l'auteur de tout don parfait réside dans son cœur pour les exaucer."

The above teaching hardly agrees with P. Gonthier's interpretation of St. Thomas. I trust that the subject will be treated, if possible *in extenso*, in the REVIEW, for the benefit of our clergy who are much exercised about the attitude of the Dominican Fathers represented by the above writer in their journal.

Resp. There is no warrant to be found in the teaching of St. Thomas far the assertions made by the writer of the article "Saint Thomas d'Aquin et la Communion pour les morts." The passages quoted by P. Gonthier are virtually mistranslated by him. From the mistranslation he finds it easy to draw the conclusion that the idea of offering Holy Communion for the deceased rests upon a theological misconception, and that the practice should be suppressed since it is prejudicial to the exercise of vicarious works of satisfaction, such as the offering of the Holy Sacrifice. P. Gonthier's tone is, however, so full of assurance and he emphasizes his

[1] Pars III, qu. 79, a. 7, p. 544.

conclusion so peremptorily that one would hardly suspect him of deficiency, much less of prevarication. Here is a sample of his interpretation. St. Thomas, in his Commentary on St. John VI (lect. VI), speaking of the effects of the Holy Eucharist on the souls not only of those who offer and receive the Sacrament, but also of others living and dead who participate in the communion of saints, continues—"nec tamen si laicus sumat hoc sacramentum prodest aliis quantum est *ex opere operato*, in quantum consideratur ut perceptio, quamvis ex intentione *operantis* et percipientis possit communicari omnibus ad quos dirigit suam intentionem. Ex quo patet quod laici sumentes Eucharistiam pro his qui sunt in purgatorio, errant."[3] This passage is translated in the article as follows: "Non pourtant que la communion d'un laïque puisse servir à d'autres, par elle-même, comme communion, mais par l'intention de celui qui opère le sacrement et le reçoit en même temps (c'est-à-dire du prêtre qui offre et communie), *ex intentione operantis et percipientis*, l'effet peut être communiqué à tous ceux pour lesquels il dirige son intention. D'où il suit évidemment que les laïcs qui reçoivent l'Eucharistie pour ceux qui sont en Purgatoire, font erreur."

Now, if the translator had observed the punctuation of the original (we quote from the Parma edition, 1860, of the *Opera omnia*, the text of which is recognized to be the most reliable hitherto published), and had observed that the word *operantis* is used in the technical sense which distinguishes it in the text from *operato;* and if, furthermore, he had omitted that little parenthetical clause of his own making, to wit, "c'est-à-dire du prêtre qui offre et communie," there would be no difficulty in recognizing the proper sense of St. Thomas. That sense is quite obviously, according to all rules of logic and grammar, this,—that Communion cannot be received by the laity for the souls in purgatory so as to benefit the latter *ex opere operato*, and in such way as if the deceased himself received it, or as if a person who had died without Viaticum could still after death make compensation for the omission by the fact that another person offers his Communion for the departed. But neither St. Thomas nor any of his disci-

[3] Parma ed., Tom. X, p. 418.

ples or commentators wish to deny that the Communion (which cannot benefit the deceased *ex opere operato*) is capable of benefiting the deceased *ex opere operantis et percipientis*, that is to say, according to the devout intention of him who receives the Sacrament, whether the priest who offers the Sacrifice or a layman who participates in its consummation by only receiving Communion, since he who receives is *operans et percipiens*. It is quite plain from the context of the sentence quoted by P. Gonthier that St. Thomas refers to persons who receive Communion, thus partaking (*percipientis*) of the Holy Sacrifice. Such persons are designated as having at the same time the *intentio operantis*, for their reception of the Sacrament is not merely a passive act but also a sacramental act admitting the meritorious application of the individual intention with which the act is performed.

"S. Eucharistia fidelibus prodest per modum sacramenti *ex opere operantis*. Hinc merito Sacra Congregatio auctoritate apostolica damnavit librum Theophili Renaudt, quo communionem pro mortuis tamquam errorem popularem, piam fraudem et sordem non ferendam impugnabat." These are the words of the commentator to De Rubeis edition of the *Summa*, and De Rubeis was a Dominican and a good theologian of the school of St. Thomas. In the same commentary we find explained the words of St. Thomas "ideo ex hoc quod aliquis sumit corpus Christi, vel etiam plures, non accrescit aliis aliquod juvamen," by the gloss "*nisi ex opere operato*, plures enim communiones magis quam una communio, caeteris paribus, aliis prosunt."

These sentiments are supported by theologians of every order and school recognized in the Church, and hence we need not argue the matter further. "Nec obstat consuetudo fidelium qui pro aliis sive vivis sive mortuis communicare solent," writes the learned Sylvius, commenting on the words of St. Thomas, "ex opere *operantis* tum ad satisfaciendum tum ad impetrandum prodest aliis."[2]

Father Gonthier wants the people to have Masses said, instead of what he thinks a useless practice, viz., offering their Holy Communions for the departed; and his article is supplemented by a notice in another part of the magazine stating that, "par décision de

[3] Ed. 1695, a. 7, qu. 79.

Sa Grandeur Mgr. l'Evêque de St. Hyacinthe, le tarif des honoraires de messes, à notre couvent de St.-Hyacinthe, est de 50 cts.," and that there is a "messe hebdomadaire pour nos abonnés." This gives to the article discrediting a very commendable practice in the Church the appearance of being simply an invitation to supply the Dominican Fathers of St. Hyacinthe with stipends. They may need the offerings of charity. But it is such methods as these which create an unhealthy atmosphere about some of the older religious communities. There have been seasons of disgrace darkening the fair name of Holy Church, and they were mainly brought on by the unsavory practices that furnished fuel to the vigilant malice of those who are ready upon every slightest pretext to charge our clergy with avarice and traffic in spiritual things. We trust that the French Dominicans who are said to be transferring their homes from the anti-Catholic Republic to the more liberal New France of Canadian America will elect to live in poverty rather than resort to methods of perverting the doctrine of the Master, which must needs arouse the suspicion that they are anxious to dispense the graces placed in their keeping for the salvation of souls, at an earthly profit.

CAN A CHURCH BE DEDICATED TO THE HOLY SOULS?

Qu. Will you kindly tell me in the pages of the REVIEW whether it is permissible to dedicate a church to the Holy Souls or not? I can obtain no satisfactory solution from any of the liturgical books accessible to me? BLACKBURN, *England.*

Resp. The law of the Church provides that churches dedicated to the service of God be honored by the name of some Saint or some title commemorative of the divine action connected with the mysteries of the Incarnation. This excludes all titles that have not direct reference to the Holy Trinity, the Angelic Choirs, or to Saints who have been recognized throughout the entire Church. The Saints (*canonizati*) are the recognized intercessors to whom public honor is paid by the Church. But neither the Beatified (*beatificati*) nor the souls of those who have died in the Lord are so honored. While the intercessory power of the faithful departed is recognized as legitimate in *private* devotion, they are

regarded in the *public* and solemn cult of the Church as objects of prayer. The two conditions are not incompatible, inasmuch as the souls undergoing the purgation which is to fit them for the enjoyment of the beatific vision are in the favor of God, who accepts the prayer of the faithful that the term of their detention in the cleansing fires of Purgatory may be shortened. The discipline of the Church on this subject is summed up in a decree of the S. Congregation of Rites: "S. R. C., annuente SSmo, quoad patronos locorum in posterum eligendos hunc ordinem servari mandavit: Quod *elegi possint in patronos ii solum qui ab ecclesia universali titulo Sanctorum coluntur*, non autem Beatificati dumtaxat."[1]

THE AMENDED TRANSLATION OF JANSSEN'S HISTORY.

We have received from B. Herder the advance sheets of the new edition, Vol. III, of Johannes Janssen's *History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages*, translated by Mrs. A. M. Christie, and published in England by Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Company.

It will be remembered that much fault had been found with the first English version because it was not only in places inaccurate, but suggested a certain bias of the Protestant translator. This was a plain injustice to the author, who was a Catholic priest, as well as to the original publisher, B. Herder, whose name appeared in fact upon the copies for the American book market. The firm of Kegan Paul was therefore obliged to make amends by publishing a revised form of the mistranslated pages. They reprinted at once twelve pages to be inserted in the copies already bound of the faulty edition. The corrections made reach to page 93 of the third volume, and we give them here in order that those of our readers who purchased the first edition may be able to note them in their copies. We are informed that the new edition will be thoroughly purged, and that those errors which we note below as still standing will be corrected.

The title page contains the imprint of both the English publisher and the American house of B. Herder, Freiburg, which owns the copyright of the German editions.

[1] *Decr. auth.*, 23 Mart. 1630.

Errors in the English Version.	Now Corrected.
Page vi, last line—"Tetzel on the sale of Indulgences."	"Tetzel on Indulgences."
	Page vii—The word "Chapter" inserted at top of page, left hand (iii).
Page 37, line 11—"the sale of indulgences and the worship of relics."	"the indulgences and the veneration of relics."
Ib., line 18—"Peter Linden."	"Peter Luder."
Page 77, line 28[1]—". . . it did."	". . . they did."
Page 77, line 15-16—". . . on the country. Julius II had proclaimed a sale of indulgences."	". . . on the Christian people, Julius II had proclaimed an indulgence."
Ib., line 18—"Leo X renewed the sale in order to raise money for the completion of the building."	"Leo X renewed the same in order to complete the building."
Ib., line 20—". . . Bulls relating to the sale."	". . . Bulls relating to it (the indulgence)."
Page 79, line 9[2]—". . . the proceeds of the sale of indulgences."	". . . the proceeds of the indulgences (alms collected on occasion of the grant of indulgences)."
Page 89, line 31—". . . theses attacking the virtue of indulgences."	". . . theses concerning the virtue of indulgences."
Page 90, line 3—". . . carrying on the sale of indulgences established by Leo X."	". . . proclaim the indulgence granted by Leo X."
Page 91, line 5[3]—". . . be applied to the particular soul it was bought for."	". . . be applied to the particular soul it was obtained for."
Page 92, line 10—". . . offering the indulgence bills and tauting the customers."	". . . offering and extolling the indulgences."
Ib., line 9—". . . to St. Jacob."	". . . to St. James."
Ib., line 27—". . . to obtain absolution."	". . . to obtain an indulgence."
Ib., line 32—". . . Romish indulgences."	". . . Roman indulgences."
Page 93, line 8—". . . such indulgences."	". . . such invectives."
Ib., line 11—". . . Romish indulgences."	". . . Roman indulgences."

[1] On line 10 of this page the word "Romish" for Roman is retained. The words are suggested as coming from the lips of Prince Carpi; but even he would not have said "Romish," which is distinctively English Protestant.

[2] In line 14 of this page the statement is made that Archbishop Albrecht's bargain to repay the Fuggers out of the proceeds of the indulgence collection was made "in the summer of 1514." Possibly this date is correct, but in the edition before us (the eighth) of the German original we read that the compact was made "in April, 1515."

[3] A few lines below (15) we find the following phrase: "Was there any certainty, however, that the indulgences obtained would be applied to the souls for which they were bought?" This needs correction.

Those who have the defective volumes would do well to make the corrections in them, lest falling into malicious hands at a later date their copy of Janssen's *History* be made the pretext of false representation either against the writer and publisher of the *History* or the Catholic Church, which in a measure they represent.

THE MEANING OF "I H S."

Qu. What is the meaning of the letters "I H S"? There are several interpretations of it given in dictionaries, but they seem more or less arbitrary.

Resp. The well-known monogram "I H S" has its origin in the Greek style of writing the name of our Saviour. It was the fashion among the early Greek Christians to abbreviate proper names in writing (especially on monuments and trinkets) by simply giving the first syllable and the final letter of the name. *H* is originally a Greek letter, pronounced ē. The other two letters are the same in Greek as in Latin. Hence *I H S* is the equivalent for *Jes.* It is in this form that we find the name of our Lord stamped upon the coins during the reign of the Christian emperors of Constantinople. The name "Christ" on the same coins is abbreviated to *XPS*, the *P* being the Greek *R*.

In later ages, especially during the Crusades, the Christians of other countries coming to the East where the Greek language had been in use, and finding this monogram upon pictures of our Lord, altars, and monuments, began to interpret the letters in their own fashion. Assuming that they were Latin letters, they read it "*I*(esus) *H*(ominum) *S*(alvator) — Jesus, Saviour of mankind," which, of course, suited well the original meaning, because the word *Iesus* in Hebrew does mean *saviour* or *help of God.*

Others read the letters as indicating the words "*I*(n) *H*(oc) *S*(igno)," viz., in this sign (thou shalt conquer). Occasionally the letter *V* was added beneath the sign to express the *Vinces* (thou shalt conquer). And again, a cross was sometimes placed over the monogram to indicate that it is the sign in which we are to gain the victory. So the Emperor Constantine is said to have seen it in the heavens, after which he placed it upon the standard which guided his army and brought victory to them.

When St. Ignatius called his order the Society of Jesus it became natural that the members should select the monogram of the Holy Name for their distinctive badge. Many read the letters "*I*(esûs) *H*(umilis) *S*(ocietas)—the humble Society of Jesus;" but this is merely a secondary interpretation, like the motto of Constantine.

Nearly every nationality has managed to read some interpretation conformable to its own tongue out of the letters. Thus in English we read it "I have suffered"; in German, "Jesus, Heiland, Seligmacher"; in French, "Jésus, humble Sauveur." All these interpretations aim at glorifying, directly or indirectly, our divine Saviour; and thus the little monogram serves a good purpose in many ways.

PREACHING AT THE LOW MASSES.

Qu. The custom in most of the city churches is to have a short instruction at the low Masses. These Masses usually succeed one another each hour. Is it necessary for the celebrant to take off any of the vestments, if he has to go to a pulpit *in the sanctuary?*

What ought he do in regard to the vestments if he preaches from the predella? What if he takes up the collection?

De Herdt and other rubricists speak only of what is to be done when there is a sermon at a Solemn Mass.

Resp. The practice prescribed by the statutes of some dioceses is to take off the chasuble and the maniple, place them on the seat within the sanctuary for the celebrant, ascend the pulpit or predella, etc. St. Charles Borromeo in his Pastoral Instructions to the Milanese Clergy leaves it optional for the celebrant to retain chasuble and maniple during the sermon: "Parochus autem animarumve curator qui inter missarum solemnia concionem habet . . . casula dum concionatur indutus vel exutus, prout maluerit."[1] The rule of St. Charles indicates that in order to determine which is the preferable method, a priest must take account of the circumstances—the time allowed for the instruction where there are several Masses succeeding each other, the nature of the sermon itself, the style of vestment which some-

[1] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.* Prs. IV. Instr. Praed. Verbi Dei.

times incumbers the preacher, the heat of the season likely to destroy a valuable vestment, etc. Where there are no special reasons for retaining the chasuble, it would seem more in conformity with the ordinary prescriptions of the rubrics to take off the chasuble while preaching. Thus the rule laid down for the deacon reading the Gospel when he wears the *planeta* (*plicata*) or folded chasuble, is to take it off and put on a broad stole; the same rule holds for the subdeacon reading the Epistle.

It is positively unbecoming for the celebrant of the Mass to go vested in chasuble into the body of the church for the purpose of taking up a collection. The chasuble is a garment set aside for the celebration of the sacred mysteries, and a proper spirit of reverence for the august Sacrifice of the altar forbids such methods, whatever a pastor may think of his own necessities.

CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL SCHOOL SUPERVISORS.

To the Editor, AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

The correspondent who in your last number proposed the formation of an organized union of the Catholic school supervisors, has undoubtedly sound ideas as to what would be best calculated to give strength and consistency to our Parochial School system. I daresay he has had experience in organizing and feels assured that it would not be impossible to bring the school superintendents to agree upon some lines of common action and to adopt a general plan for the steady and systematic improvement of the methods throughout the States. At the same time, from personal observation in this field I strongly suspect that plans of unification will not effect much, unless pastors can be made to recognize the duty of taking a direct and personal interest in the work of teaching in our schools.

Many of us undertake to build school houses, to secure teachers, and to collect funds for the maintenance of the schools, but never take or show any real interest in the work of the teachers or the children by attending the examinations and doing something to encourage the hard-worked Sisters or Brothers; while the children, who are half-driven instead of being drawn to the classes, never know those little attentions of their pastor which would make them love both him and their school. It is said sometimes that the blame for

the lack of interest on the part of the pastors lies with the bishops, who ought to see to it that the priests give catechetical instruction and otherwise interest themselves in the classes. That, however, cannot be accountable for all the lassitude. The fault seems to me to lie in the training of our theological candidates. The seminary is the place where the methods of pedagogy as well as the duty of the priest to take a hand in the teaching work ought to be instilled; and yet I do not believe there is any seminary where pedagogy and the care of the schools receive adequate attention. Priests get the idea, largely from our seminary training, that the only duties they have are to say Mass, preach, administer the Sacraments, and take up collections; and that they have no responsibility with regard to the school, or at any rate the class room.

I. WONNAUGHTHEM.

To the Editor, AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

The letter of a correspondent in your October issue on Catholic School Superintendents was read, I am sure, with much interest by those who are engaged in the work of Catholic education. When the extent and importance of the Catholic educational system are considered, it seems strange that an organization or union of Diocesan Superintendents does not exist.

At present each superintendent is working alone in his own diocesan field. He knows little of what others are doing, save what may be gleaned from a fugitive notice in a Catholic newspaper. Yet it were idle for any one to deny or to minimize the part that the Catholic educational system must play in the progress and welfare of this great nation. That the full measure of this responsibility may be fulfilled, it should command the service of the best Catholic thought and experience in the country. It is to be hoped that something permanent will result from your correspondent's opportune suggestion. Our educational system, with its Universities, Colleges, Academies, its Parish Schools—and its million of pupils—warrants a national organization.

P. R. MCDEVITT.

We have received other letters, occasioned by C. E. Waldorn's correspondence in our last issue, containing suggestions and comments regarding the proposition to unify the Parochial School

system. As the lack of space prevents us from publishing them all in the present number we shall be obliged to resume the subject in the December issue.

THE SACRILEGE OF JUDAS ISCARIOT.

Qu. At a recent retreat given to the clergy, I was somewhat surprised to hear it stated by the Father, that it is the opinion of modern Biblical critics that Judas neither made a sacrilegious Communion nor was he raised to the dignity of the priesthood. The latest conclusion would seem to be that Judas left the supper-room before the Consecration, and was absent when our Lord conferred on the disciples the dignity of the priesthood.

May I ask what is to be said in support of this opinion, which runs counter to a common tradition that Judas did make a sacrilegious Communion and was ordained a priest?

Resp. The common tradition that Judas did make a sacrilegious Communion cannot be shown to rest upon any deduction from Scriptural sources. Modern exegetes greatly differ in their interpretation of the passages in the Synoptics referring to the moment when Judas left the cenacle. Knabenbauer in his Commentary[1] seems to favor the opinion that the traitor had left the room before the institution of the Blessed Sacrament; and he thus reads John 13: 30. This view is sustained by the manner in which the ancient text of Tatian is disposed. It has also on its side the testimony of the so-called Apostolic Constitutions, and that of St. Ephrem, S. Asphraates (Jac. Nisib.), St. Cyril of Alexandria, and Innocent III (*De alt. mysterio*, 4, 13), who answers the question "Quid ergo est tenendum?" as follows: "Illud forte sine praejudicio aliorum, quod Joannes insinuat, quia cum Judas accepisset buccellam panis, exiit continuo. Christus autem post alios cibos tradidit Eucharistiam." The same interpretation is given by Lamy, as also, to use the aforementioned Jesuit commentator's words, "by far the greatest number of recent writers," which probably includes Protestant exegetes, who have no reason to differ from our text interpretation in this instance. Arnold, Schanz, Keppler, are of the opposite

[1] *Cursus S. Script. I in Matt.*, p. 439; *III in Luc.*, p. 576.

opinion, and support the view of SS. Cyprian, Chrysostom, Jerome, the two Cyrils, Augustine, Leo, and the Angelic Doctor.

The difference of view is perhaps suggested by the alternate efforts of the Christian teachers to emphasize in the example of Judas, on the one hand, the awful fate of those who commit sacrilege, and, on the other hand, to safeguard the reverence for the holy mysteries which our Lord could not have readily exposed to danger by inviting the traitor to seal his crime, already sufficiently determined upon, with the reception of the Blessed Eucharist. As for the priestly character of Judas, it can hardly be assumed, since he did not participate in the complete initiation to the sacred mission which was given after the Resurrection.

DEACONS OF HONOR FOR VISITING BISHOPS.

Qu. Would you be kind enough to give the following query your earliest attention? Can the Ordinary of the diocese give permission to visiting bishop or archbishop to have deacons of honor at Solemn High Mass? J. J. F.

Resp. There is no sanction in liturgical authority for the privilege sometimes accorded to bishops "non ordinarii" to have deacons of honor. "Hujusmodi assistentia facienda est tantummodo Episcopo loci Ordinario, et nulli alteri, etiamsi sit delegatus, qui in sede Episcopi sederet."[1]

[1] *Cf.* O'Leary, *Pontificalis*, p. 81.

The Dolphin

BOOK NUMBER OF THE

American Ecclesiastical Review

NOVEMBER, 1901

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

SACRED SCRIPTURE.

1. **Criticism.** — Prof. G. Frederick Wright has been making geological researches in Central Asia and claims to have found scientific facts that render credible not only the flood, but the narratives of other Biblical miracles, such as the crossing of the Jordan, and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.[1] *The Independent*, in its criticism of Prof. Wright's conclusions respecting the Deluge, contends that the acceptance of Biblical chronology implies the assumption that the Deluge occurred not more than 5,000 years ago, a supposition opposed by geology and history. Prof. Wright publishes in *The Advance*[2] what is evidently, though not ostensibly, an answer to *The Independent*, maintaining that Biblical chronology is not intended to be a strictly historical chronology. The writer illustrates from our Lord's genealogy as given in the first chapter of St. Matthew and from I. Par. 25 : 24 the summary way in which Biblical writers refer to genealogical lines of descent. They used them in a rhetorical way, much as we say "sons of the Pilgrim Fathers," leaving out of view everything but the line of descent. The author finally refers us to an article published by the late Prof. William Henry Green, of Princeton, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*,[3] as the fullest and clearest discussion of this subject ever presented.—Eduard Stucken presents us with

[1] *Cf.* THE DOLPHIN, August, 1901, p. 45.
[2] Chicago, August 29.
[3] April, 1890.

a new instalment of the *Astralmythen*,[4] in which he endeavors to establish the different parallels to the history of Esau, as found in the mythologies of various nations. The author assures us from the very start that during the course of his present study he has come to the conclusion that all myths found among the various nations of the earth can be reduced to the creation myth. The differences of the variants are only apparent; he admits, however, that it is difficult even for us to perceive the real identity of the various myths. In order to reach this end we must carefully distinguish between the type and the motive of the myth; it is not the former, but only the latter, that spreads over the earth. The type may be really different, being a man in one place, a woman in the other; a hero in one country, an enemy in the other; but the motive remains the same under all these various types. Mr. Stucken then proceeds to divide the history of Esau into three scenes: the struggle of the brothers in their mother's womb, the hunt of Esau, and the reconciliation of the two brothers. The first of these is declared to belong to the group of the inimical brothers; the second is identified with the blind Isaac and the blind huntsman Orion; the third belongs to the group of the friendly brothers. The author enumerates the various types under which these scenes are developed, keeping, however, the same motives. While the reader will no doubt admire the erudition of the writer, he will be astonished, too, at his bold imagination. There is hardly an occurrence in our daily life that cannot be transferred into the region of myth by the application of a similar process of comparison.—*The Universalist Leader* for September 7 believes that Prof. Harnack, in his recent lectures on the "Fundamentals of Christianity," has taken the most extreme ground thus far occupied by German rationalism. "He has advanced so far as to declare that 'the person and work of Jesus formed no part of the gospel that the Messiah preached'; that, he contends, consisted in faith in God the Father." According to this position of the Professor the New Testament will have to be rewritten, and all the utterances ascribed to Christ in regard to His personality and work will have to be eliminated.

[4] *Astralmythen der Babylonier und Aegypter.* Religionswissenschaftliche Untersuchungen von Eduard Stucken. IV. Theil, Esau. Leipzig. 1901.

2. Exploration and Discovery.—The *Académie des inscriptions* resolved at its last meeting to reproduce in exact colors the mosaic map of Palestine which was discovered at Madaba a few years ago. We need not remind the reader of the importance of this publication for the closer study of ancient Palestine, and the French body of learned men deserves our thanks for bearing the expense of the undertaking.—In connection with the foregoing subject we may mention the publication of a *Topographical and Physical Map of Palestine*, by J. G. Bartholomew, edited by Dr. G. A. Smith.[5] The map is on the scale of four miles to an inch, and measures 4 feet 8 inches by 3 feet 3 inches; it includes the country from Beirut in the north to the Arabah in the south, and extends as far east as Damascus and Jebel Haurān, being based throughout upon all the latest surveys and researches, both English and German. It is issued in two forms—either mounted on cloth and in cloth case, with Index, or mounted on rollers and varnished, with Index separate. In the first form it costs 10s. 6d.; in the second 15s. The map promises to be the standard map of Palestine for a long time to come.

3. Introduction.—Prof. Zahn has at last yielded to the entreaties of his friends and has added to his Introduction to the New Testament at least an outline of the history of the New Testament Canon.[6] Professor Zahn's main difficulties affecting the history of the Canon regard the period between Origen and Justinian. And since he did not find it possible to add a third volume concerning this critical time to his two-volume History of the Canon, he determined to express in the present outline briefly and clearly his opinion on the most important features of the case. The author himself calls his little work an enlarged and corrected edition of his article *Kanon des Neuen Testaments* contributed to the third edition of the Protestant *Realencyclopädie*. After an introductory chapter containing definitions, the history of the New Testament about 170–220 A. D. is considered, and again that of the period 140–170 A. D.; then are traced the oldest vestiges of

[5] T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh.

[6] *Grundriss der Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons. Eine Ergänzung zu der Einleitung in das Neue Testament.* Von Theodor Zahn. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1001.

a collection of Apostolic writings. Origen and his school are reviewed, the development of the New Testament in the Syrian Church is followed up, the opinions and influence of Lucian, Eusebius, and Athanasius are described, and the further development of the Canon in the Greek-speaking Churches of the East is studied. The solidity of the author is too well known to need our commendation.—The *Expository Times* for September[7] reviews under the heading "Recent Foreign Theology" a publication called *The Gospel of Truth*.[8] The reviewer reminds us of the story concerning the signboard hung upside down and the Irishman standing on his head so as to be in a proper position for reading it. The author, it appears, spares himself no pains, and his reader no labor, in order to reverse all that has been held concerning the authorship of the fourth Gospel. Besides, the reader is kept in suspense till he reaches p. 368; thus far he is made to feel that there is a great book seeking to be restored to its author, and that there is a man who ought to be an author seeking for his book; the book is the fourth Gospel, and the would-be author is Menander, the Gnostic. Hence, it follows as a matter of course that "Menander of Antioch is the author of the fourth Gospel, the Gospel of Truth." Briefly, it is Menander's *apologia pro vita et doctrina sua;* thus has Dr. Kreyenbühl victoriously brought to an end the long separation between book and author, and has once for all righted the cruel wrong inflicted by the tradition of the Church. We need not remind the reader that the work stands judged by its evident absurdity.—Another attempt to describe the origin not only of the fourth Gospel, but of the first, second, and third as well, has been made by Wilhelm Soltau.[9] First the synoptic problem is studied, and its solution may be reduced to the following steps: The *Logia*, arranged by St. Matthew in Hebrew or Aramaic, translated by the Apostles into Greek, and then put in writing, form the first source of the three

[7] 538 f.

[8] *Das Evangelium der Wahrheit, Neue Lösung der Johanneischen Frage.* Von Johannes Kreyenbühl, Doctor der Philosophie. Erster Band. Berlin: C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn. 1900.

[9] *Unsere Evangelien, ihre Quellen und ihr Quellenwerth, vom Standpunkt des Historikers aus betrachtet.* Von Wilhelm Soltau. Leipzig: Dietrich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1901.

synoptic Gospels. The narratives of St. Peter concerning the life and doctrine of Christ were translated and (about 70 A. D.) put in writing by St. Mark, who added afterwards an introduction and several supplementary notes. These same narratives, enriched by an unknown author with what forms now Mk. 6: 45–8: 26, and by Aristion with the present conclusion of the second Gospel, Mk. 16: 9–20, constitute our second Gospel, and they together with the *Logia* form the source of our first and third Gospels, a so-called proto-Matthew joined together the *Logia* and the second Gospel, grouping the events so as to give the connected *Logia* a proper historical setting. The proto-Matthew sets more value on morality than on dogma; he teaches a Christianity without dogma. In the course of time many beautiful stories came into circulation concerning the birth and childhood of Jesus, and about some of His parables. This accumulation of new material, as well as the disturbance of the second Gospel's chronological order by the proto-Matthew, induced Luke to write his Gospel, following the strictest chronological order in the arrangement of his material; thus our third Gospel came into existence. Seeing that our first Gospel was still without any history of Christ's birth and childhood, and giving way to the pressure of a dogmatic tendency to post-apostolic Catholicity, a deutero-Matthew enlarged the then existing Gospel according to Matthew, and thus produced our first Gospel. As to the fourth Gospel, it was, according to Soltau, written by John the Presbyter of Asia Minor, who knew the first three Gospels, but gave in his book a picture of the religious condition of the second century. The reader is sufficiently well acquainted with the true principles of inspiration as well as the history of the New Testament Canon to judge of the foregoing theory.

4. Commentary.—In the October issue of THE DOLPHIN[10] we mentioned the appearance of the *American Standard Revision* of the Bible and its claims to render the original text more faithfully and fearlessly, and to remove obsolete and obscure words that have become unintelligible to the average reader. The New York *Sun*[11] doubts whether many of the rejected archaic words and forms were really unintelligible; it believes the revisers might

[10] P. 116 f.

[11] September 3.

have credited the people with a little more intelligence. The Detroit *Evening News*[12] fears that the American experts have been more honest than wise in showing to the world the errors of King James' translators. The Baltimore *American*[13] is of opinion that there is not one of the rejected words that would have puzzled a half-grown schoolboy.—The Russian savant Kulesch left at his death a translation of the whole Bible into the language of Little Russia. The work was revised, supplemented, and corrected by J. Lewizki, and then the widow of Mr. Kulesch applied for permission to have it published; but the Russian authorities refused the permission, so that Mrs. Kulesch had to make arrangements with the British Bible Society for the publication of the translation; according to the *Köln. Ztg.* she has sold the copyright for the sum of 5,000 rubels.—We are glad to welcome F. Blass's *Evangelium secundum Matthaeum cum variae lectionis delectu*[14]; the reader acquainted with Blass' edition of Acts will know what accuracy and erudition he may expect to find in the new publication.—F. N. Peloubet also has enlarged our recent Matthew literature by the publication of a *Teacher's Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew;*[15] there is always room for more books on Sacred Scripture that really instruct the reader or guide the religious teacher.—W. Wrede has published a little work that may be classed among the commentaries on our second Gospel, though it does not profess to be a commentary in the technical sense of the word; it rather develops the Messianic idea contained in the Gospels.[16]—P. Fiebig again investigates the true meaning of the expression "Son of man" as it occurs in the language of our Lord Himself; he urges especially that the Aramaic expression has the general signification "man."[17]—Those readers who know Fr. Meschler's *Life of Christ*, or his meditation books, will be glad to learn that the Rev. author has contributed an article on our Lord's way of dealing with men, in the Septem-

[12] August 31.

[13] September 1.

[14] Leipzig, 1901, XVIII, 110 pp.

[15] London, 1901, 414 pp.

[16] *Das Messiasgeheimniss in den Evangelien.* Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständniss des Marcusevangeliums. Göttingen, 1901, XIII, 291 pp.

[17] *Der Menschensohn.* Jesu Selbstbezeichnung, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des aramäischen Sprachgebrauchs für Mensch untersucht. Tübingen, 1901, VII, 127 pp.

ber number of the *Stimmen;*[18] he draws special attention to Christ's edifying conduct, His charity and amiability.

5. Related Subjects.—Dr. Jakob Royer publishes in the fifth fascicle of the sixth volume of *Biblische Studien* a monograph on the eschatology of the Book of Job.[19] After premising the definition of eschatology in general, and its meaning among the Israelites during pre-exilic times in particular, the author clearly states the question under discussion, inquires into the time and authorship of the Book of Job and its affinity with the other writings of the Old Testament. Then he proceeds to show what the Book of Job teaches concerning the origin and nature of the soul, concerning life and death, concerning Sheol and the liberation therefrom, concerning reward and punishment in the other life, concerning the "waking out of the sleep," and the idea of a resurrection; finally the author draws attention to the fact that the Book of Job does not really represent the drama of only one individual, but tells the history as well as the secret of many a human heart tried with suffering.—Arthur Stahl publishes a little work in which he summarizes a vast amount of erudition concerning the first Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, the Epistles of St. Ignatius, and the Shepherd of Hermas.[20] All Biblical students know how intimately these subjects are connected with the history of the Canon and with the authenticity of a great part of the New Testament; the author has therefore lightened our work considerably by reducing all this material to a convenient form.—The *Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung*[21] contains a short article on the *Shepherd* of Hermas, which appears to be a synopsis of Dr. Dan Völter's work on the visions of Hermas, the Sibyl, and Clement of Rome.[22] The author repudiates, however, Völter's opinion that the *Shepherd* is of Jewish origin and has been expanded and interpolated by Christian writers.

[18] *Der Heiland im Umgang mit den Menschen.*

[19] *Die Eschatologie des Buches Job unter Berücksichtigung der vorexilischen Prophetie.* Freiburg: Herder'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1901.

[20] *Patristische Untersuchungen,* von Lic. theol. Arthur Stahl. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1901.

[21] N. 169, p. 5 f.

[22] *Die Visionen des Hermas, die Sibylle und Clemens von Rom.* Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Berlin: G. A. Schwetschke und Sohn. 1900.

THEOLOGY.

CONTINUING an article already noticed, Dom Renaudin, in the *Revue Thomiste* (September), writes that belief in the Assumption, although held as certain, seemed not to enjoy all the favor it deserved from a theological point of view, until the time when the Immaculate Conception was defined. Many chose to see in it only a miraculous fact attested by human witnesses. But on what does the infallible Church base her belief? Since she teaches this truth to the faithful, it must be either part of revelation, or a necessary conclusion, or a thing demonstrated by natural means. Now as to the first hypothesis, examination shows the Assumption is not revealed implicitly in the Immaculate Conception or in any other prerogative of the Blessed Virgin. It remains to be seen if it may not have been implicitly revealed in another way.—In the same magazine, P. Mandonnet continues a controversy already noticed,[1] heading his paper with the following: "*Certum est quod Sedes Apostolica semper inclinavit magis in sententiam Probabilismo contrariam*—Thyrsus Gonzalez, Praepositus Generalis S.J. *Libellus Supplex* Clementi XI, *anno* 1702 *oblatus.* vii." The writer declares himself to be the author of the review of P. Bertrand's brochure, and thus to be responsible for the statements assailed by P. Brucker, S.J., in the *Études* (March 20th). P. Mandonnet goes on to say that he is not satisfied with the proofs alleged by P. Brucker, whose dissertation is "vague and obscure, full of amphibologies, by means of which he draws conclusions not contained in his premises." Nevertheless, such as it is, the latter's dissertation "contradicts his original statement that the decree of Innocent XI against Probabilism never existed." After complaining that P. Brucker runs the risk of deceiving his readers by using "The Pretended Decree of Innocent XI" as title for an article wherein the existence of that decree was declared incontestable, the writer declares that for a while he inclined to close the discussion when he found that the existence of the decree was no longer questioned. "But upon reflection, after having considered the unsatis-

[1] THE DOLPHIN, May, 1901, p. 88. (*Ubi corrige ut sequitur:* For "probabilism," in line 15, read "probabiliorism; and for the second "probabilism," in line 12, read "probabiliorism.")

factory exposé which the Reverend Father has given of the decree of Innocent XI, and the evasions to which he has stooped in order to escape consequences so disagreeable for probabilism; having also noted his digressions from his subject, made for the purpose of gathering together specious historical arguments in favor of his client—from an appeal to 'the oldest doctors' (presumably the Apostolic Fathers), among whom probabilism 'was already in the position of a more or less explicit principle,' to a mention of the opinions of M. Trouillot upon probabilism—I at last determined upon accepting the Reverend Father's challenge. It will not be useless labor. The authors of manuals of moral theology, who cry up probabilism as a sovereign panacea, leave their readers invincibly ignorant of the historical facts which indicate the constant attitude of the Roman Church in opposition to probabilism; for the Church has taken this position on several occasions, as is witnessed by the words of the General of the Jesuits used as a heading to this article; nor is there anything to indicate that she is ready to change it." The writer continues through some twenty pages and promises a further instalment in the future.—A signed book-notice in the same magazine, from P. Jansen, C.SS.R., deals with the *Tractatus de gratia divina* of P. Schiffini, S.J. The reviewer complains that the author has not represented the Thomistic system fairly and accurately. "By saying that the system of St. Alphonsus must face the combined difficulties which are encountered by Thomism and Molinism, he shows that he does not know the nature of the *gratia efficax* and the *gratia sufficiens* recognized by the holy Doctor." P. Schiffini's treatment of St. Alphonsus is even less satisfactory than that accorded by PP. Pesch, S.J., and Schneeman, S.J. "We deny to none the right to assail the teaching of St. Alphonsus; but to ignore him so completely as P. Schiffini has done in a matter where the authority of the Saint is so expressly against him, does not seem to accord with scientific honesty and with the respect due to a Doctor of the Church."

In the Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature religieuse (July to October) P. Turmel presents St. Augustine's views on Original Sin before and during the Pelagian controversy. Saint Augustine had to do pioneer work in gathering proofs of the doctrine from

the works of his predecessors. "If he had been obliged to draw from these texts the proof of an original sin *properly so called*, his efforts would have been perfectly vain." But to refute his adversary's statements, it was enough that he should present texts which asserted the Fall of Man, and many such texts were easily found among both Latin and Greek Fathers.

In the Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie (H. 3.), P. Fonck, who criticises Harnack's Essence of Christianity, remarks that more than 20,000 copies of it have already been put through the press. He notes with amazement certain highly favorable notices of the volume that have appeared,[2] and comments particularly upon the statement of P. Lagrange, who recognizes in Harnack "a real director of souls" and in his teaching "the sincere accent of a deeply religious soul."[3] P. Fonck remarks that for the most part the book contains only repetitions of former output. He deplores the fact that it presents pure naturalism under the cloak of Christianity, and moreover without even a pretense of proof. Harnack coolly rejects the Fourth Gospel, never hinting that his opinion is not universally accepted and that he himself has elsewhere confessed his uncertainty as to the proper solution of the Johannine question. Harnack's treatment of miracles is even more superficial and arbitrary. Despite P. Lagrange's words, it seems that Harnack has no more respect for supernatural revelation than had the rationalists of fifty years ago. Some other criticisms of the work are mentioned.[4]

P. Lehmkuhl's article in the *Stimmen* (H. 6), already noted to our readers, has called forth some criticism. One critic in the *Literarische Beilage der Kölnischen Volkszeitung* (N. 29), insists upon the right of the public press to comment upon the defects in the approved system of teaching moral theology, just as it has a right to defend Catholic doctrine against calumnies. The *Wis-*

[2] Prof. Drews in *Christliche Welt*, 1900, N. 46. Prof. Bousset in *Theologische Rundschau*, IV, 1901. Franz Strunz in *Natur und Offenbarung*, XLVI, 1900, 505.

[3] *Revue Biblique*, X, 1901, 110.

[4] W. Walther, *Harnack's Wesen des Christenthums*. Leipzig. 1901. E. Ruprecht, *Das Christenthum von D. Ad. Harnack nach dessen 16 Vorlesungen*. Gütersloh. 1901. G. Reinhold, *Das Wesen des Christenthums: Eine Entgegnung auf Harnack's gleichnamiges Buch*. Wien und Stuttgart. 1901. O. Albrecht, in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1901, 338. P. Gutberlet, *Pastor Bonus*, XIII, 1901, 382.

senschaftliche Beilage zur Germania (N. 31) also defends its previous criticism and declares that P. Lehmkuhl is less intent upon affirming his view than on "awakening doubt as to the true Churchly sentiments of those who recommend another moral method than he himself favors. . . . Not a word has been said (by us) against the Church; the question concerns only the moral theologians." In the *Stimmen* (H. 8), P. Lehmkuhl answers his critics. He refers to proposition 13 of the Syllabus, and insists on the fact that the Church is really responsible for the method used in theology, and therefore that she is herself assailed when methods universally in use are censured. He comments, too, on the outcry raised by some anti-Catholic journals at his statement that the handling of moral questions is not a matter to be settled by the public or by the secular press. He then sets forth the Catholic notion of the province of ecclesiastical authority in these matters.

Some time ago P. Dausch reviewed[5] the history of literature on inspiration as far as the year 1890. As the past decade has been particularly rich in additions to this department, P. Pesch in the *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* (H. 3), begins a resumé of the chief Protestant and Catholic publications during that period. The first paper indicates the variations and the liberalizing tendencies of German writers about the date 1891.

In Commer's *Jahrbuch* (H. 1), P. Schultes, O.P., exposes the doctrine of St. Thomas upon the essence of Biblical inspiration, relying mainly upon the *Summa Theologica*, 2. 2. qq. 171–175; *Questiones Disputatae:* de veritate, q. 12; and the *Summa contra Gentiles*, III, 155. The general notion of prophecy or inspiration includes four elements: an illumination of the intellect; a movement of the will; an excitement of the imagination; a determination of the faculties used for oral or written expression. Between inspiration and revelation there are various differences. According to St. Thomas, it seems that Biblical inspiration should be defined: a supernatural influence by which God moves and raises the faculties of man to manifest for the Church's benefit what God wills, and only what He wills, and as He wills. The same idea is prominent in the definition of the Vatican Council

[5] *Die Schriftinspiration: eine biblisch-geschichtliche Studie.* Freiburg. 1891.

(Sess. III, c. 2) and in the "Pdrovientissimus Deus."—The same magazine contains an article by P. Josephus a Leonissa denying that "Pseudo" can rightly be prefixed to the name of Dionysius the Areopagite.

In the new magazine of the Spanish Jesuits, *Razón y Fe* (Sept.), P. Murillo outlines the history of the nineteenth century's systematic and general attack upon revealed religion, an attack managed with great skill, and making war principally under cover of rational speculation and historical criticism. In Germany these attacks originated with Lessing and Kant in the shape of the transcendental philosophy and Biblical criticism. Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Feuerbach, continued the hostile work in philosophy; and simultaneously there developed from the Darwinian system the atheistic materialism of Huxley, Vogt, Haeckel, and Spencer. All agreed in substituting some other ideal in the place of the real God of true philosophy. Criticism has done even more harm by making many imprudent people think that revelation is a fiction and without firm foundation. The doctrine of Lessing, Reimarus, Strauss, and Baur are described; and then comes the mediating school of Harnack, Wellhausen, Jülicher, and Pfleiderer. A few words are then given to affairs in France, England, Italy, and Spain, which last "has had very little share in the anti-religious movement."

In the *Biblical World* (Sept.) occurs an article on Faith by the Rev. A. T. Burbridge, in the form of a discussion of Hebrews 11: 1, which, though "not a definition of faith," unfortunately "has been almost universally treated as such." Faith in this passage must be taken "as simply an effort on the part of man's spiritual nature towards God, which has its result in various different forms, the essence of the faith, however, consisting in the making of the effort." In regard to things unseen, "we are deprived of one of our most ordinary methods of proof; then what is to take its place? We answer faith, faith is proof. Not faith as contrasted with rationalism, not faith as contrasted with scepticism and doubt, but faith as expressing the energy of a man's soul, the highest form of activity of which he is capable." (We note the above as an example of a kind of writing common enough in Protestant literature, and inviting a comparison with Catholic pronouncements on similar subjects.)

P. Norbertus del Prado, O. P., writes in Commer's *Jahrbuch* (H. 1) on the essential characteristics of physical promotion according to the teaching of St. Thomas. Regarding the action of the human will, St. Thomas teaches: as to the exercise of an act, the will moves itself; as to the determination of an act, the will is moved by the intellect. Anything that can act on the intellect can move the will in the latter way; but only God can move the will in the former way, because He alone can act intrinsically on the will. The former kind of action is *motio moralis;* the latter is *motio physica.* Now, though not every *praemotio physica* is an efficacions grace, yet every efficacious grace is formally constituted by a physical premotion. And there are certain essential characteristics of physical premotion which prove the intrinsic efficacy of grace. For:

1. Physica praemotio est Dei motio immediata immedatione suppositi in ipsam potentiam liberi arbitrii.

2. Est Dei motio immediata immediatione virtutis in ipsum actum liberi arbitrii.

3. Est Dei motio determinans ad unum potentiam liberi arbitrii.

4. Est Dei motio faciens nos velle hoc vel illud.

5. Est Dei motio, ad quam necessario necessitate infallibilitatis sequitur effectus in potentia liberi arbitrii, qui est eligere vel consentire.

PHILOSOPHY.

IF we may take the literary output as a measure, the intense interest which until quite recently was devoted so largely to the study of empirical psychology is now being drawn off towards social phenomena. Psychology seems to be dissolving into sociology. Perhaps this may be taken as a healthy sign of a waning egoism and an increasing altruism; or it may be the natural resultant of the growth of psychological research itself on its social side; or, again, it may be that the productivity of psychoses has been somewhat overtaxed and the field must needs be allowed to lie fallow for a time. Be all this as it may, certain it is that the social sciences are being cultivated with astonishing assiduity, and

although the products are not all fair or healthy, out of the large crop it is not difficult to select some that are both. Foremost amongst these we would single out Rae's *Contemporary Socialism*[1] and, with some limitations, Hirsch's *Democracy versus Socialism*.[2] Together, the two works furnish, within their compass, a complete study of the socialistic movement; the former from an historical, the latter from a critical standpoint.

Contemporary Socialism appeared first in 1884; but those who know the book only in its earlier form will find the recent edition greatly improved and enlarged. No commendation of the book is needed here. It is generally admitted to be a standard work on its subject, having probably no compeer in the English language in respect to comprehensiveness, thoroughness, and lucidity. The unique and perhaps the most important section of the work is that which tells the history of socialism during the past decade. The two most noteworthy features of that history observed by Mr. Rae are the remarkable advance made by the social democrats as a political party in several Continental countries, and their not less striking simultaneous growth in moderation. As illustrating the former of these features the following statistics may interest the reader:

"At the German Parliamentary elections the Socialist vote was already the highest in 1890; but it has risen by 50 per cent. since then. In 1890 it was 1,427,000; in 1893, 1,788,700; and in 1898, 2,120,000, or one-third of the total poll. With this vote the party returns 57 of the 397 members of the Diet, and the Socialist group is the strongest but one of the fifteen groups which sit and fight in that assembly. In France, where the Socialists are more divided than in Germany, the joint Socialist vote was only 91,000 at the election of 1889, but it rose to 598,000 in 1893, and 839,988 in 1898, and the party has now 38 seats in a Chamber of 581, and, a thing hitherto unheard of, one of the Socialist deputies is a Minister of State. Belgium, long indifferent to the movement, gave a strong Socialist vote in 1894 at the first election after universal suffrage was granted in 1893, and it has been increasing that vote steadily ever since. At last election, in 1898, more than a third of the whole votes recorded were cast for Social Democratic candidates, and there are now 29 Socialist deputies in a Chamber of 152. The result is the more notable because the new Belgian franchise is unfavorable to Socialist candidates, for though the suffrage

[1] *Contemporary Socialism.* By John Rae, M.A., LL.D. (Edin.). Third edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901.

[2] *Democracy versus Socialism.* A Critical Examination of Socialism as a Remedy for Social Injustice and an Exposition of the Single Tax Doctrine. By Max Hirsch (Melbourne). New York and London: Macmillan. 1901.

is universal, it is not equal. It allows two and even three votes to be given by men of property and position, while workingmen, on whom Socialist candidates mainly depend, have only one. In Italy, at the recent election of 1900, the Socialists increased their vote from 76,000, as it was in 1895, to 215,000, and their number of deputies from 16 to 34 in a Chamber of 508. In Austria, 11 of the Parliamentary representatives are Socialists; in Denmark, 9; in Holland, 4."—(*P. 501.*)

If the socialism of to-day were governed by the older revolutionary principles, the world might well look with terror upon its increasing numbers. There are, however, at least some reassuring signs in its change of practical programme,—its adoption of political and parliamentary measures, and its devotion to progressive social reform. "New weapons, new tactics," says Liebknecht. "Revolutionary methods," says this quondam advocate of revolutionism, "were the methods of the anarchists, and the anarchists had done nothing by them but alienate workingmen. You could put all the anarchists in Europe into a pair of police wagons. With their ridiculous revolutionary phrases, their senseless attempts at assassination, and their stupidities generally, they have done nothing for the proletariat, and have merely worked into the hands of their adversaries."[3]

A special chapter of the book is given to the Christian Socialists. Here the Catholic student will naturally look for an account of what has been called, or rather miscalled, Catholic Socialism, an organized movement for the material betterment of the laboring classes inaugurated and sustained by Bishops von Ketteler, Moufang, Martensen, and others in Germany, a movement that has spread during the past quarter of a century into Austria, Belgium, Switzerland, and France. Mr. Rae's account is on the whole impartial and sufficiently sympathetic to make us almost overlook his observation that "Italy is the only Catholic country in which the Church holds aloof from the social movement, forgetting the unusual miseries of the people in an ignoble sulk over the loss of the Pope's temporal power" (p. 243). "Among Protestants," the author remarks, "what is called Christian Socialism is little more than a vagrant opinion in any country; but among Catholics it has grown into a considerable international movement and has in several States—

[3] *Protokoll über die Verhandlungen des Parteitages zu Erfurt*, 1891, p. 209.

especially in Austria—left its mark on legislation." On the other hand, as Mr. Rae is careful to note, "the Catholic Socialist movement shows no disposition to coquet with revolutionary socialism; on the contrary, its leaders often say one of their express objects is to counteract that agitation—to produce the counter-revolution, as they sometimes put it."

"Our Christian Socialists in London accept the doctrines of Marx, and hold the laborer's right to the full product of his labor to be a requirement of Christian ethics, and the orators at English Church Congresses often speak of socialism as if it were a higher perfection of Christianity. But Catholic Socialists understand their Christianity and their socialism better than to make any such identifications, and regard the doctrines and organizations of revolutionary socialism in the spirit of the firm judgment expressed in the Pope's Encyclical of December 28, 1878, which said that 'so great is the difference between their (the socialists') wicked dogmas and the pure doctrine of Christ that there can be no greater; for what participation has justice with injustice, or what communion has light with darkness?' This plain, gruff renunciation is on the whole much truer than the amiable patronage of a very distinguished Irish bishop at the Church Congress of 1887, who said socialism was only a product of Christian countries, (what of the socialism of savage tribes, or of the Mahdi, or of the Chinese?) that the sentiment and aspiration of socialism were distinctly Christian, and that every Christian was a bit of a socialist, and every socialist a bit of a Christian."—(*P. 245.*)

The primary theoretical as well as the practical attitude of Christianity towards socialism are so clearly and graphically presented by Mr. Rae that the reader may welcome the following paragraph:

"Socialism may proceed from an aspiration after social justice, but a mistaken view of social justice is, I presume, really injustice; and, as the Pope says, what communion can there practically be between justice and injustice? Idolatry is a mistaken view of divine things—a distortion of the religious sentiment; but who would on that account call it Christian? The socialist may be at heart a lover of justice; he may love it, if you will, above his fellows; but what matters the presence of the sentiment if the system he would realize it by is ruled essentially by a principle of injustice? Justice, the greatest and rarest of the virtues, is also the most difficult and the most easily perverted. It needs a balance of mind, and in its application to complicated and wide-reaching social arrangements, an exactitude of knowledge and clearness of understanding which are ill replaced by sentimentalism, or even by honest feeling; and the fault of the current talk about Christian socialism and the identity of socialism with Christianity is that it does not conduce to this clearness of understanding which is the first requisite for any useful dealing with such questions. If socialism is just, it is Christian—that seems the sum of the matter. But do socializing bishops believe it to be just? Do they believe, as all socialists believe, that it is unjust for one man to be paid five thousand pounds a year, while his neighbors, with far harder and more drudging work, cannot make forty pounds?

or do they believe it wrong for a man to live on interest, or rents, or profits? or would they have the law lay its hands on property and manufactures, in order to correct this wrong and give every man the income to which he would be entitled on socialist principles? It is good, no doubt, to have more equality and simplicity and security of living; but these aspirations are neither peculiar to Christianity nor to socialism."—(*Pp. 245-246.*)

Democracy versus Socialism is a critique of socialism. Why the author selected this title, or in what way, if at all, the system denoted by the former term is opposed to that expressed by the latter, or whether both systems are to be compared with a third or not, we do not find explicitly stated. Probably, however, the last is the case; but then the term Democracy must be taken to signify the land for the organized people, and in this acceptation the author's thesis may mean that Democracy thus conceived furnishes the solution of the social problem, a solution that socialism fails to afford. So far as the critical side of the work is concerned it deserves praise. It analyzes the economic, ethical, and political conceptions and principles of socialism, with the changes in social arrangements and disastrous consequences they would entail. The concluding portion of the work is constructive. It points out the reforms necessary to bring the present social system into harmony with the principles for which the work stands. Had the author limited himself to criticism he would certainly have added a praiseworthy contribution to anti-socialist literature; meritorious in this that it examines socialism not simply under one or other aspect, but as a whole, in its principles and in their logical and practical consequences. The same ground has, it is true, been covered (although Mr. Hirsch is unaware of the fact) by Cathrein in his work on Socialism;[4] but no apology is needed for multiplying attacks on the common enemy.

While, however, the author is successful in showing the wrongfulness and impracticability of socialism, he fails, we think, in his constructive task, in the devising of a remedy for the present social evils. His position in this respect is briefly as follows: Man as an individual has certain natural rights, but none that extend to private ownership of land; the right to the use of the earth being equal for all men. Hence justice con-

[4] *Socialism Exposed and Refuted.* New York: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

demns private ownership of land as interfering with the law of equal freedom. It is therefore the duty of the State to frame and enforce regulations safeguarding this right. The enforcement of such regulations in the present order of things is beset with great and obvious difficulties. To meet them none is so effectual and so far-reaching in its beneficence as Henry George's Single Tax method, which consists in "the gradual appropriation of the rent of land and of natural monopolies and the similarly gradual removal of all other taxation and charges for the use of equal and natural and social opportunities" (p. 379). Mr. Hirsch argues plausibly in favor of this method. He is, of course, alive to the objections made by economists against it. These he meets no less adroitly. Whether or not the Single Tax theory possesses actually all the balm for social wounds which the author discovers in it; and whether it be free or not from all the greater evils which other economists prophesy of its application, are matters still subject to speculation. Perhaps the problem does not admit of an apodictic solution. The weak point in the work at hand, we believe, lies deeper, viz., in the denial of individual right to landed proprietorship. That the proofs for this position are not conclusive seems a fact fairly well established by the arguments that have in recent years been so frequently and so ably urged against it. See, amongst others, Castelein's *Le Socialisme et le Droit de Propriété;* Schaub's *Die Eigentumslehre;* Cathrein's *Agrarian Socialism;* Holaind's *Ownership and Natural Rights.*

Professor Willoughby in his *Social Justice*[5] has also written an able chapter refuting the same position. This modestly called Essay is a study of those fundamental moral concepts, centering in that of justice, a clear understanding of which is essential to any profitable discussion of social problems or methods of reform. The author aims at two principal objects: (1) at classifying the notion of justice, first in itself and in its bearings on the distribution of economic goods; (2) as it is implicated in the harmonizing of freedom and coercion, liberty and law. Under the first heading he treats of equality, property, the labor theory

[5] *Social Justice.* A Critical Essay. By Westel Woodbury Willoughby. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1900.

in its relation to distributive justice and to property in land. Under the second head, the right of coercion, the ethics of competition, and punitive justice divide the discussion. The Catholic student must take exception to some of the author's statements, such as, for instance, that "the mediæval idea was one of separation of Church and State" (p. 8); or that "the Christian religion as taught [in mediæval times] was generally non-social and often anti-social" (p. 9); or that "the idea of freedom was introduced by the Protestant movement" (*ib.*). He will also object to Henry C. Lea[6] or Andrew Dixon White[7] being cited as reliable authorities on the Church's legislation, whether on the usury question or on any other subject (p. 12). But overlooking incidental errors of this kind, the result of the author's unacquaintance with Catholicism, we are grateful for the large amount of solid argument and valuable and interesting facts, which the volume contains. The student will do well to read the volume in connection, say, with some such kindred work as Vermeersch's *Quaestiones de Justitia*.[8] The author himself would be likely to obtain desirable material for a future edition from the latter work, as also from Cathrein's *Moralphilosophie*, and *Recht, Naturrecht und Positives Recht*.[9] He will also find a truer view of the history of usury than the one he has adopted (p. 121) in Funk's *Zins und Wucher*[10] and in the *Dublin Review*, October 1873, and January 1874.

[6] Ecclesiastical Treatment of Usury, *Yale Review*, February, 1894.
[7] *Warfare of Science and Theology.*
[8] New York: Fr. Pustet & Company. 1901.
[9] St. Louis, Mo., Freiburg: B. Herder. 1901.
[10] Tübingen, 1868.

Criticisms and Notes.

RENAISSANCE TYPES. By William Samuel Lilly, Honorary Fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge. New York: Longmans, Green & Company. 1901. Pp. 400.

When, fifteen years ago, Mr. Lilly published his *Chapters in European History*, he argued that, "whatever the Renaissance was, it was not a new birth unto liberty either in politics or in literature, in art or in science" (Vol. I, p. 299). If the Renaissance, that is to say, the revival of classic learning which is supposed to have effected a moral transformation of Europe, be dated from the age of Dante, Roger Bacon, and Nicola Pisano, then Michelangelo might be called the prophet, he thought, of that age; but if we limit the revival period to the humanistic Renaissance, then Buonarroti is its prophet,—only as Jonah was the prophet of Nineveh, or Lot of Sodom (Vol. II, p. 61). In his present volume the author treats the subject more in detail. He regards the Renaissance period as extending from 1453 to 1789, allowing, of course, that the roots of the later period are buried in an earlier, though new, idea germinating under the ruins of the old order, as it fell to decay and dissolution. His object is to show what we do owe to the Renaissance; and his diagnosis of the social, political and religious conditions of the age lead him to the conclusion that the Renaissance has enlarged our mental horizon by a reawakened interest in the sources of our moral and intellectual life. He allows that we owe to it a truer appreciation of the unity of Western civilization; that it was a resurrection not merely of the classical spirit, but also of Christian antiquity. Even if he did not state the fact explicitly, it would be plain from his contention that he does not agree with Dr. Pastor (*Geschichte der Päpste*) who holds that there were two entirely distinct movements in the revival,—one pagan, and the other Christian; one true, and the other false; and that these were naturally antagonistic. Mr. Lilly quotes some instances from the German historian of the Papacy tending to corroborate the view that the representatives of the humanistic movement were on friendly terms with those whose office it was to promote the interests of religion and the Church.

But the main point for which our author makes is the demonstration that the Renaissance is not responsible for any vaunted liberation of conscience in religion, or for the establishment of the principle of

political freedom, although he grants that there were elements latent in the movement which in the far off event contributed to such freedom. What he sees as a direct result of the revival is the reintroduction into Europe of the Cæsarism of the antique world: that was its political idea. And he conjectures further that "possibly this discipline of absolutism may have been necessary for the realization of an ampler state of liberty, just as the ascetic discipline of the Middle Ages may have been necessary for the wider culture of the Renaissance" (p. 392).

As for Michelangelo, Mr. Lilly pictures him as the supreme exponent of the genius of the Renaissance, the seer, absolutely true, seizing in his verses no less than in his sculpture and painting "the very essence of the thing, and presenting it in its living reality," and awakening in others an adequate enthusiasm for the like qualities. If Mr. Lilly considers Michelangelo as the prophet who delights in giving a spiritual, that is, an ethico-intellectual expression to every truth, Erasmus is regarded by him as the representative man of letters during that period. To him he assigns the prerogative of having vindicated the essential rights of human reason. The starting-point of the philosophy of Erasmus was reason speaking through conscience. It was for the great moralists of a later age, Suarez, Vasquez, and others, to vindicate scientifically what Erasmus had maintained, namely, that ethics rest on self-evident principles and the nature of things, and on rational deductions therefrom (p. 173).

From Erasmus, the representative man of letters, Mr. Lilly goes on to a study of Reuchlin, the representative *savant* of the Renaissance. Here our author incidentally scores Froude's statement about Reuchlin in his *Life of Erasmus*. "Honestly to seek the truth, boldly to speak the truth, patiently to suffer, if need be, for the truth, is the law of scientific inquiry. That was the law of Reuchlin's life" (p. 230).

In Luther, whose influence forms the topic of the next chapter, Mr. Lilly sees the incarnation of the very opposite principle, or, as Erasmus put it, "ubicunque regnat Lutheranismus, ibi literarum est interitus." Yet, by a secret logic that rules human destinies, Luther's doctrines produced consequences of a secondary nature most alien to the intentions of their originator. They broke the yoke of a tradition which, however salutary in its primary purpose, had become overladen with the statutes and dogmatic interpretations of earthly rulers acting under plea of divine right and grace. True, Luther

substituted the yoke of the Biblical letter for the yoke of a narrowed spirituality bounded by pretense of theological condition; but in the transition there came relief and new breath and new movement which favored the freer circulation of the life-blood within the Church.

In pleasing contrast to the self-opinionated individuality of the patron of the Lutheran revolution stands Thomas More, the saint. If Michelangelo may be regarded as the prophet of the intellectual and moral revival of the Reformation period, Thomas More "represents the highest perfection of character discernible among the men of the Renaissance." As Buonarrotti was the artist that expressed the noblest idea in marble, pigment, or verse, so St. Thomas Morus expressed the ideal in his living form by making the inner action of his motives appear in the habit of noble word and deed. It is a beautiful picture that Mr. Lilly's clever and sympathetic hand outlines for us of this great Christian hero, one of those who, in Cardinal Newman's words, "seems ordained in God's providence to be the salt of the earth; to continue in their line the succession of His witnesses, though death sweep away each successive generation of them to their rest and their reward. These communicate the light to a number of lesser luminaries, by whom, in its turn, it is distributed through the world. . . And thus, the self-same fire, once kindled on Moriah, though seeming at intervals to fail, has at length reached us in safety and will in like manner, as we trust, be carried forward, even to the end."[1]

In presenting these five great agents, who may be styled types of the Renaissance, for the student's consideration, Mr. Lilly furnishes a key to the leading characteristics that marked the movement. With its aid we are able to account for the seemingly divergent and opposing results of the great triple movement of the humanists, the reformers, and the French revolutionists, which has caused historians to take radical and exclusive views as to the agencies at work. To say that there were latent principles in the revival which contributed to "progress in the direction of organized and assured freedom," will seem to many a wider concession than the Catholic apologist or historian of the average type is willing to allow. We see no sacrifice of principle in such admissions, especially when they help to establish, as Mr. Lilly shows, the conclusion that "civil and religious liberty cannot be accounted among the characteristics" of the Renaissance.

[1] *Oxford University Sermons.*

We earnestly recommend Mr. Lilly's outspoken but thoughtful and masterly volume to students of history and letters, whatever may be their preconceptions regarding the work produced by the Middle Ages and the Renaissance down to the French Revolution.

ANSELM AND HIS WORK. By the Rev. A. C. Welch, M.A., B.D. (Series of the World's Epoch-Makers, edited by Oliphant Smeaton.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901. Pp. 251.

St. Anselm belongs to the class of true reformers whose lives serve to illustrate the contrast between the restless spirit of criticism which seeks to justify insubordination to lawful authority under the plea of zeal, and the well-ordered, temperate, and consistent censure of evil or abuse which emanates from a holy life, devotion to duty, and the maintenance of the principle of obedience to law. A portion of Anselm's youth was spent in worldliness, but the seeds of virtue implanted in his heart by his saintly mother, Ermenberga, eventually found their way into light. Under the guidance of Lanfranc, his countryman, he became a monk, and finally prior of the famous abbey of Bec, in Normandy, whose discipline was to become a byword for the splendor of virtue and learning which it begot under Anselm's initiative, although not without much opposition from the jealousy and indolent spirit of some of the monks.

Anselm's relations to Lanfranc, who had become Archbishop of Canterbury, and the care of several newly-established monasteries of his order, brought the Prior of Bec repeatedly to England, where the king, gradually conceiving a high esteem for him, detained him as his counsellor. William the Conqueror had shown considerable partiality in recommending ecclesiastics of Norman origin for preferment to influential offices in the Church. His successor, William II, went farther, and gave a pronouncedly national bias to all his judgments and appointments in ecclesiastical affairs. His principal aim was to isolate the Church in England from all Roman influence, since the latter was likely to check his assumptions in disposing of episcopal and abbatial preferments. Thus the see of Canterbury had remained vacant for a considerable time after the death of Lanfranc. Anselm had prevailed upon the king, during a seemingly fatal illness, to yield up his simoniacal pretensions, while the bishops of the realm had nominated Anselm to the vacant see of Canterbury. The king, although well disposed towards Anselm, having recovered from his illness, changed his mind and hoped that things might take a favorable turn by compromise. But the Archbishop-elect was not disposed

to accept the proffered dignity with the likelihood before him of a perpetual conflict between his sense of duty and the king's capricious ambition. He accordingly refused the office unless the monarch should pledge himself—first, that he would restore all the Church revenues he had confiscated; secondly, that in spiritual matters he would be absolutely guided by the authority of the Archbishop under whose ecclesiastical jurisdiction he was; thirdly, that he would foster friendly relations with Urban II, the legitimate Pope.

The story of Anselm's subsequent troubles, mainly due to the weakness of the other bishops, who desired to stand well with the king, and who to this end abetted his pretentious schemes, are well known. When Henry I, younger brother of William II, succeeded to the throne, the old difficulties took on only a new phase. Anselm appealed to Rome, and obtained a decision from the new Pontiff, Paschal II, forbidding any newly elected bishops to seek investiture at the hands of the king, although the existing condition of dependence in temporals on the part of those whom the king had nominated and invested was to remain unaltered. Thus Anselm succeeded in solving the problem which had arisen from the division of jurisdiction between the temporal and spiritual sovereigns of England. It is this feature of his life that becomes the basis of the characteristic difference of view taken of St. Anselm by English Protestants and Catholics respectively.

Mr. Welch gives us an appreciative portrait of the Saint. He has drawn his material from various and reliable sources, principally from Eadmer's *De Vita et Conversatione Anselmi*, in whom we have the estimate of a contemporary and intimate. Of later works, the one most rich in reliable details is Père Ragey's *Histoire de St. Anselme, archevêque de Canterbury;* while the background is furnished by such recent works as the Abbé Parée's history of the monastery of Bec, describing the condition of culture and education in the monastic institutions of that day, which is far from discouraging for the student who looks for light in the so-called Dark Ages. It is only when the author of this very readable sketch of St. Anselm's life touches upon the subject of Roman jurisdiction or monastic exclusiveness that he shows any bias. While he appreciates the advantages of a central authority under which Christians unite for the unification of doctrinal and disciplinary matters, he considers appeals to Rome, such as that of Anselm against Henry, as apt to fasten an intolerable yoke upon a nation (p. 243), although he does not blame Anselm, who was forced into this act by the fact that he had no support from his bishops.

In like manner the author does not sympathize with the stringent measures inaugurated in the English councils of St. Anselm's day, enforcing celibacy upon the whole body of the secular clergy; it was the effect, our author believes, of the introduction of monkish ideals which the Benedictine revival had wrought (p. 237). But these views are the result of the writer's religious position. The volume is particularly instructive with reference to the renewed discussion opened by Professor Jones's new volume regarding the basis on which union may be effected between the Established Church of England and the Church of Rome.

DIE ESCHATOLOGIE DES BUCHES JOB, unter Berücksichtigung der Vorexilischen Prophetie. Dargestellt von Dr. Jacob Royer, Pfarrer zu Sulzbach. (Biblische Studien, Bd. VI, Heft 5.) St. Louis, Mo., und Freiburg, Breisgau: B. Herder. 1901. Pp. 156.

In an interesting and erudite way Dr. Royer traces the notion of immortality and a future state as current among the Jews before the exile. He shows, by comparison of expressions found in the prophetic, didactic, and historical writings of the Old Testament, that there existed from the earliest Hebrew age not only a constant and well understood belief in the continuance of the individual life after death, but also that the notion of a judgment after death and of an expiatory state ultimately to end in absolute beatitude with God was commonly received.

This belief the author demonstrates in detail to be beautifully exemplified in the poetic reflections of the Book of Job, which, whatever we may hold regarding its actual authorship, was received by the Jews before the time of Esdras on authority which they considered contemporary, if not of equal influence with that of Moses. It is true that nowhere in the Sacred Text do we find a formal and direct statement of the doctrine of immortality and judgment; nevertheless, it is very evident from many utterances in the Sacred Text that this doctrine was fully understood and accepted.

In the three main divisions of his work Dr. Royer examines the eschatological notions of the pre-exilic period in general; then he proceeds to analyze the historical basis upon which the eschatology of the Book of Job rests. This implies a study of the relation which the Book of Job bears to kindred writings of the Old Testament, such as the Psalms and Proverbs, Isaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, and Habakuk. Finally, he makes critical application of the facts and principles resulting from the previous examination to the dramatic poem which,

under the form of Job, gives us a picture not simply of an individual but as well of the human soul in its struggles and trials through life, with its hope of a future retribution measured out by the justice and mercy of the Creator.

The study of Dr. Royer presents the latest phases of the question of interpretation, and is therefore of actual value, particularly to the Bible student. Moreover, it brings out into strong relief the fact that the doctrine of Purgatory in the Catholic sense is an inheritance that has come to us from the Hebrew Church of an age long before the period of the Macchabees, to whom we usually appeal as witnesses of the belief. This is an important fact for the apologist and should greatly lessen the prejudice against the notion of Purgatory which Protestants who profess belief in the Bible usually entertain. The early Christians, among whom were many converts from Judaism, surely accepted this doctrine, and this in an even more rigorous and definite sense than the later ages of Catholicism, as is shown in those acts of the Martyrs commonly assigned to the age of Tertullian.

ARNOLD'S EXPEDITION TO QUEBEC. By John Codman, 2d. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1901. Pp. 340.

Although the story of a disastrous failure might well be thought an unwelcome venture to a patriotic American, the author has succeeded in weaving in with it so much of interesting anecdote, clear description, and accurate detail, that his monograph is no less interesting than valuable. It is written largely from original sources. In addition, "the author had one advantage over other writers who have touched on this campaign, in that he followed on foot or in canoes, for the greater part of the distance, the army's course through the Kennebec, Dead River, and Chaudière regions, and visited Quebec and its environs, and in like manner traced the route of Montgomery, with whose force Arnold was coöperating, over Lake George, Lake Champlain and the Richelieu River to Montreal." The volume contains a map of the army's route from Newburyport to Quebec (540 miles) and a large detailed map of Quebec and its environs. There are also a number of pictorial illustrations, some from original photographs taken by the author. Appendix A gives a bibliographical list of contemporary journals, American, English, French and Canadian. Appendix B gives details of the subsequent careers of the members of the expeditionary force. Appendix C contains some account of the relics of the expedition. A complete index closes the volume.

JESUS LIVING IN THE PRIEST. Considerations on the Greatness and Holiness of the Priesthood. By the Rev. P. Millet, S.J. English translation by the Right Rev. Thomas Sebastian Byrne, D.D., Bishop of Nashville. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1901.

P. Millet's work has not been generally known, despite the fact that it has run through several editions in the original French and in an Italian translation. Perhaps the omission, in the first issue, of the author's name may account for this. Bishop Byrne makes his translation from an Italian version which he found in Rome. Of the book itself he says that the oftener he reads it the more instructive, edifying, and delightful it appears to him.

The work is planned upon five principal aspects of the priestly life typified in the life of Christ. After viewing in a prefatory "Consideration" the idea of the priesthood in general—that is, the dignity and requisites of the sacerdotal state—the author places before us in successive reflections the characteristics of the hidden, the public, the suffering, the Eucharistic, and the glorious life of the priest. These divisions are developed in a practical and attractive fashion. Thus, under the general consideration of the priestly state, we are led to examine the nature of the sacerdotal spirit, which is to be that of Christ seeking the salvation of souls. A meditation in this section on the Causes of Sterility in the Sacred Ministry shows that the entire secret of priestly success is individual holiness. There is a great deal of glamour and noise that look like success in the holy ministry. It is the success of the politician, the juggler, the advertising agent. It convinces, but never converts. It makes a momentary glare, rises quickly like a rocket; but has none of the qualities of the star, that, being formed by the process of attraction to a fixed centre, develops through a silent and slow but regular and lasting process into a light-giving body in the heavens. In another Consideration we have a picture of the priest, the man of retirement and recollection; the man of obedience; the priest in his study, at prayer; then, through all the stages of his public ministry, braving the censure of the world, the misjudgments of superficial brethren, the discouragement of temporary failure, the hardships of toil in the quest of souls. The last chapter considers the reward of faithfulness, the glory of victory in the priestly life.

There is a section of useful notes at the end of the volume. These consist of brief suggestions on the reading of the Psalms, the nature of ecclesiastical celibacy, prayer, the use of Sacred Scripture, the study

of scholastic theology and of other subjects, the necessity of directing pastoral zeal especially towards men, the method of catechising, the necessity of self-restraint and of combating our natural inclinations. The volume concludes with the mention of "certain usages sanctioned by the Church in the administration of the Blessed Eucharist, and certain others which she has condemned."

ROADS TO ROME. Being Personal Records of Some of the More Recent Converts to the Catholic Faith. With an Introduction by His Eminence Cardinal Vaughan, Archbishop of Westminster. Compiled and edited by the Author of "Ten Years in Anglican Orders." London, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co. 1901. Pp. 344.

Here are three score educated men and women of England, more or less prominent in social life, who, being asked, tell us why they became Catholics. Some, like Father Edward Watson, a Cambridge man, and at one time a lawyer, go back to the days of their childhood for the first indications of a tendency towards the light of the Church. Others, like Lord Brampton, arrived at the conclusion late in life as a result of anxious serious thought. Not a few found themselves unexpectedly confronted with the problem of responsibility to God which involved a search after revealed light. One of the most interesting accounts in this connection is that of Mr. Duffus Harris, a gentleman who had at one time resided in America and had been greatly influenced by his "constantly meeting with scientific men of mark from American universities, such as Harvard and Pennsylvania, who were without any definite religious convictions, but who seemed to take it for granted that if our spiritual knowledge justified the acceptance of any definite Creed or Church, no other Church but that of Rome was worth considering." He mentions that one of the most prominent Biblical critics of Harvard, Professor Toy, has lately given a course of lectures at that University, in which he has demonstrated that every Catholic doctrine to which Protestants most strenuously object, such as that of Purgatory and Indulgences, is an inevitable consequence of the teaching of the Gospels, provided ordinary methods of reasoning be employed. Most of the replies are brief, covering from two to five pages; a few extending over ten or more pages. But all are interesting and edifying, and may do no little good in awakening thoughtful and hesitating minds to arrive at a conclusion which will take them out of darkness into light and peace.

Book Notes.

A new volume entitled *England and the Holy See* is announced as in press by Longmans, Green & Company. It is from the pen of Mr. Spencer Jones, an Anglican clergyman well known for his books popularizing among Protestants the Sulpician method of catechetics. The work is likely to make some stir, not only because it advocates reunion with Rome *on a basis of submission*, but also because it is introduced with a preface by Lord Halifax, foremost figure among Anglicans to-day. "Thoughtful men," writes the Very Rev. Prior McNabb, "are watching the Anglican Church with an anxiety unknown perhaps since Newman's days;" and it may be that an open statement of the Roman Catholic position from a representative of the Anglican party, without exaggeration or diminution, honestly facing all the difficulties which so often upset souls on their way Romewards will, in this centenary year of Newman's birth, bring about the final crisis that solves the English Church problem.

The Görres Institute for the promotion of literary studies among Catholics has brought together at Rome some of the most learned ecclesiastics of Germany in order to make special historical studies in the Vatican Archives. The universal attention of the cultured world has only lately been directed to the published work of Dr. Ehses, President of this department of the Society. Another recent achievement of these indefatigable workers is presently announced in the early issue of the *nova collectio* of Diaries, Acts, Letters, and Tracts of the Council of Trent. The first volume will contain the Commentary of Ercolo Severolo and four of the Diaries of Angeli Massarelli. The credit of this publication is due entirely to the intelligent and unwearied zeal of Dr. Sebastian Merkle, and the splendid spirit of the Herder house, which did not hesitate to take the work in hand even though assured of a monetary loss running into five figures—on the first volume alone. It is a work which will be greatly valued by all students of ecclesiastical history.

Lady Herbert of Lea does not seem to grow older, if we may judge from her unceasing literary activity. She is to give us a translation of the Abbé Le Camus' *Les Enfants de Nazareth*, which is a picturesque interpretation of "autrefois par aujourd'hui." We hope the publishers have been made to reproduce the fine illustrations and the neat typography of the original (Paris et Bruxelles: A. Vromant) with that inimitable dedication vignette "au petits enfants de ma famille: Madeleine, Raymond, Jacques, Jean, Georges, Paul, Maurice, Sophie ma filleule, et à leurs chères Mamans,"—which indicates the author's love for children, and foretells the happy ways in which he describes Nazareth with its workshops and fountain, its little girls and boys singing in the streets, its mothers and fathers busy in their homes occupying the sites where the Holy Family once lived and labored and prayed.

The third volume of the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, edited by Cheyne and Black, is ready. Another volume will complete the work, which is sold only by subscription.

Cadieux et Derome, of Montreal, have issued a new catalogue of useful reference to French books. The firm does certainly much good by the propaganda of good literature through its monthly bulletins, in which it adheres strictly to the principle of excluding questionable works of the popular Parisian sort.

One of the best works treating in a practical way a series of *Casus Conscientiae* is a volume published some time since at Brussels. The author represents St. Peter examining different persons as to their earthly records and settling their cases according to approved principles of ethics and moral theology at the gate of Paradise. We hope to introduce the gifted author, M. André le Pas, to the readers of the REVIEW at an early date.

Catholic teachers and Christian mothers are surely under great obligation to Father Thurston, S.J., for having edited those gems of instructive pamphlets: one for the children, *Talks before Confession*; and the other for those who prepare the little ones for their first Confession. Mother Mary Loyola, of the York Convent, England, must have had a wonderful influence with children, judging from her knowledge of their hearts and needs.

Professor George Barton, of Bryn Mawr College, who has made extensive studies in Semitic literature, is announced as having ready for the press a volume dealing with the early social and religious elements of the Hebrews. The book is to be published by The Macmillan Company.

M. Vallery-Rodot has written a Life of Dr. Pasteur, his father-in-law, the English edition of which will shortly appear (McClure, Phillips & Co.).

Dr. Condé B. Pallen has written a dramatic poem dealing with the difficult subject of St. Simon Stilytes. It is in the hands of a Boston publisher.

In 1841, when Newman was still at Oxford, he conceived the design of giving to the world a series of Lives of the English Saints. Two years later, in a letter to Mr. J. W. Bowden, he speaks about it as a series to be edited in numbers, to be entitled *Saints of the British Isles*. He was then still an Anglican, and the work came out before he was received into the Catholic Church in October, 1845. These Lives are now being republished by the J. B. Lippincott Company.

The above recalls the Jesuit Father Meyrick's *Life of St. Willibrord*, Archbishop of Utrecht, which, published anonymously as *A Sequel to the Lives of the English Saints*, was dedicated to John Henry Newman, of the Oratory, in 1877.

We have watched with interest the gradual development and growth of what is now called *Benziger's Magazine*, a Catholic home periodical that is easily the peer of any of our popular monthlies. We understand that it is soon to publish a story from the pen of the author of *My New Curate*.

Recent Popular Books.

AGUINALDO: Edwin Wildman. *Lothrop.* $1.20 *net.*

A biography equally hostile to the pretensions of the rebel chief, and to the religious orders which he began his career by opposing. Its account of the relations of Aguinaldo with the American army and navy is based upon personal knowledge, the author being Vice-Consul at Hong Kong, and it is trustworthy. Illustrated from photographs.

ANVIL: R. V. Risley. *Lippincott.*

The hero is told by his old teacher that his nature is symbolized by the anvil, typifying selfish idealism. He first loves an unworthy woman, but will not marry her, rejects all other love for her sake, refuses to avenge himself upon her betrayer, preserving his ideal of hate and pity. It is rather fine spun, but better than the author's earlier books.

BLENNERHASSETT: C. F. Pidgin. *C. W. Clarke.* $1.50.

The story of Burr's conspiracy setting Burr in the light of an injured patriot, and using every hint afforded by history to darken the character of Hamilton. It is greatly superior to its author's first book, but unjust in partisanship.

CHURCH BUILDING: Ralph Adams Cram. *Small.* $2.50 *net.*

Collected and revised papers originally printed in the *Churchman*, and using "Church" as synonymous with Anglican. The author exhibits fine contempt for shams, pettiness, stinginess, and stupidity, and uses many churches of his own sect as bad examples. The book is excellently illustrated by 125 plans, designs, drawings of church buildings and half-tones from photographs of churches and interiors. Not only the building but glass, embroidery and carving are considered and illustrated. The binding and printing are in excellent taste.

CINDERELLA: S. R. Crockett. *Dodd.* $1.50.

The villain, after enriching himself by stealing the treasure of rubies held by his mother in trust for his niece, makes a household drudge of the girl, and last, when she wears a ruby necklace, accuses her of stealing it from him. Her innocence is proved in an amazing way and she marries the prince who belongs to all Cinderellas.

DEATH OF THE GODS: Dmitri Merejkowski. Translated by Herbert Trench. *Putnam.* $1.50.

Julian the Apostate is the hero, and the author seems to be anti Christian, introducing no attractive Christian characters and appearing to approve of certain persons who find it possible to harmonize Christianity and the worship of the Olympians. Of necessity, the pagan rites and practices being plainly described, the book is unfit for the young.

DESERT: John C. Van Dyke. *Scribner.* $1.25 *net.*

A fascinating and enthusiastic description of the Colorado-Mohave desert earnestly intent upon bringing its atmospheric effects and its color before the eye and of impressing the mind with its climatic value. The author does not imitate Ruskin, but his subject is so nearly akin to some considered in Ruskin's earlier work that he often brings the elder author to mind.

FIRESIDE SPHINX: Agnes Repplier. *Houghton.* $2.00.

Nine delightful chapters on the cat of antiquity, the Dark Ages, in the time of persecution, in the Renaissance, and in England; showing the cat in art, triumphant, giving descriptions of gifted French cats, and the cat of to-day. A portrait of Agrippina, the author's famous cat, other full-page plates by E. F. Bensall, an appropriate cover, and chapter headings and tail pieces give appropriate setting to the author's wit and learning. This is a book about cats, not a scissors-made "cat-book."

FLOOD-TIDE: S. P. McLean Greene. *Harper.* $1.50.

A jilted and bankrupt man of the

world marries an uneducated but docile and beautiful native of a fishing-village, takes a share in the life around him and watches the lives of his former betrothed, a female doctor, and of a wayward, pretty foundling with three lovers, and also the eccentricities of the "saints" and the "advents," the chief sects of the neighborhood. The wife is a charming creation.

FOOTING IT IN FRANCONIA: Bradford Terrey. *Houghton.*

Nine pilgrimages undertaken for love of birds, and diversified by observation of plants, beetles, trees, and even berries. Thoroughly well written, genial, and also accurate.

FRIEND WITH THE COUNTERSIGN: B. K. Benson. *Macmillan.* $1.50.

The time covered is from October, 1863, until the close of the war. The hero has enlisted in the Union Army, loses his memory from a wound, and serves with the Confederates. When he recovers he is within the Union lines, understanding the whole position. He does excellent service as a scout, is forced to serve among the Confederates to save his life, and ends the usefulness of two spies in the Union camp.

GAGE OF YOUTH: Gellett Burgess. *Small.* $1.00 *net.*

A very pretty book of about fifty poems, truthfully expressing the temperament of the young American Protestant, his patriotism, his revolt against the thing given him as religion, and his general audacity. In technical quality the verse is excellent. In reading it, the title must be kept constantly in mind, for much of it would be almost blasphemous in the mouth of maturity.

GENTLEWOMAN OF THE SLUMS: Annie Wakeman. *Page.* $1.50.

A charwoman, very slightly educated, tells of her life since she went into service at twelve years of age, was misled, then illegally married, and at last wedded to a brutal drunkard. It is unpleasant reading, but painfully possible in its details.

GREAT GOD SUCCESS: John Graham. *Stokes.* $1.50.

Biography of a journalist who desires success first, but thinks himself lofty in principle even after he has sold himself, rather than give up the luxuries of life. The more respectable devices of "yellow" journalism are described at some length.

JACONETTA: HER LOVES: Mrs. M. E. M. Davis. *Houghton.* $0.85, *net.*

A little girl's violent but unspoken fancies for various men and boys and for another little girl are related with much humorous enjoyment. Child-life in a large family on a Louisiana plantation in slavery days is the background. The story is not meant for children, but for lovers of children.

JACK RACER: Henry Somerville. *McClure.* $1.50.

A young man attempting to abandon a life of harmless folly and to enter into politics is at first thwarted by unjust suspicion of being the cause of a young woman's disappearance. He endures defeat, although innocent, rather than reveal her whereabouts without leave. When cleared of suspicion he begins a happy useful life. The author is agreeably humorous.

KING'S MESSENGER: Suzanne Antrobus. *Harper.* $1.50.

The heroine, a married woman dressed as a boy, brings a letter to the Governor of Louisiana, commanding the arrest of a certain man, but, falling in love with him, delays the delivery of the letter to the wrath of his enemy, who pursues her with offers of his own affection. Her unloved husband's arrival further complicates matters, but he and her husband kill one another. King Louis changes his mind, and the lady, who has behaved with propriety, weds the man of her heart.

LASSIE: Author of "Miss Toosey's Mission." *Little.* $1.00.

A nurse compelled to renounce her cherished plan to go to South Africa in order to care for her ungrateful

drunken father, dies just before the return of her comrade laden with honors, and betrothed to the man whose love for "Lassie" was killed by seeing her in her sordid home.

LAZARRE: Mary Hartwell Catherwood. *Bowen.* $1.50.

Lazarre is the Indian name of Eleazar Williams, held by many to have been the lost Dauphin of the Temple. The story of his childhood after his supposed death, of his youth among the Indians and later among white men is skilfully told.

'LIAS WIFE: Martha Baker Dunn. *Page.* $1.00.

An island off the Maine coast is the scene of a wife's secret temptation and self-conquest, only the resident minister being aware of her trouble. Her mother-in-law, a vampire invalid desirous of being the centre of interest for every one; her patient, witty father-in-law; a fashionable woman of intensely acid speech and a spinster of great discernment, are the unconscious spectators. The spirit of the book is tenderness itself. A curious episode of a fortune teller uncommonly lucky in her predictions does not exaggerate the superstitious feeling in American fishing villages.

LIGHTHOUSE VILLAGE: Louise Lyndon Sibley. *Houghton.* $1.50.

A series of conversations revealing not only the speakers' characters but those of other persons, tells a slight story and describes a large group of characters with marked traits, chiefly droll. Sad touches here and there accentuate the prevailing tone. The language is the dialect of the New England village.

MISTRESS BRENT: Lucy M. Thruston. *Little.* $1.50.

A story of early days in the Maryland colony, with brave Margaret Brent and Leonard Calvert as its chief characters. The Calvert Catholicity is not very evident, but Calvert is attractive and the lady, her brother and her future sister-in-law are well described. The dress of the time receives much attention.

MRS. WIGGS OF THE CABBAGE PATCH: Alice Caldwell Hegan. *Century.* $1.00.

A poverty-stricken mother with five children consoles herself with a humorous philosophy of her own, and is the instrument of bringing parted lovers together. The chief events occur at Christmastide, and would make a good reading for a Christmas entertainment.

NEHE: Anna Pierpont Siviter. *Wilde.* $1.50.

The story of Nehemiah with some added details of his doings at the Persian court and with descriptions of Persian and Hebrew manners. Dignified and uncommonly accurate in coloring.

NEST OF LINNETS: F. Frankfort Moore. *Appleton.* $1.50.

The Linley family is the "nest" and the story of Sheedan's wooing of the beautiful Elizabeth is the centre of the plot. The spirit of the time is excellently rendered, and the book is the essence of a small library of memoirs and letters.

NIGHTHAWK: Alex. John. *Stokes.* $1.50.

A female Confederate spy's career in Europe, and in the United States makes the story together with an introduction showing how dearly she won her fearlessness. The Nighthawk is a blockade runner which she uses. The captain whom she loves, the hypocritical girl whom he loves, Confederate secret service men of many grades and an English officer whom she marries, are the chief persons. Many of the incidents are historical.

OUR HOUSE-BOAT ON THE NILE. Lee Bacon. *Houghton.* $2.00 *net.*

A journey of some two hundred miles up the Nile and the return voyage is described by a lady who played dragoman for the journey which was undertaken that her husband, Mr. Henry Bacon, might make pictures of the river and shore between the first and second cataracts. The thirteen pictures are admirable and the text is vivacious and amusing.

OUR LADY VANITY: Ellen Olney Kirk. *Houghton.* $1.50.

A beautiful, selfish girl obtains all her heart's desires by asking for them with audacious sweetness. After marrying the rich lover stolen from her sister, she plans to elope with her former betrothed, and is prevented only by her father-in-law's forcible interference, and her husband's shrewdness. She falls into a decline and succeeds in being a centre of attraction to the last moment. She is meant to typify the young woman grown in a family and a social circle, given over to vanity and condemned by all the worthy personages.

PORTION OF LABOR: Mary E. Wilkins. *Harper.* $1.50.

The pretty, clever heroine, the daughter of a factory hand, refuses the college education offered to her by a rich friend, and, when her father loses his work on account of his age, goes into the factory herself. The coarseness of her mother and aunt; the pitiful humility of her father, and the arrogance of her uneducated grandmother are described with truth that becomes unjust because it is pitiless, but the heroine is the best figure ever drawn by the author.

RAFFLES: E. W. Hornung. *Scribner.* $1.50.

Seven stories in which a burglar in the exercise of his vocation is the hero, with the narrator as his assistant. They are clever, and the decadence of Raffles below the romantic standard is skilfully shown. His patriotic and self-sacrificing death almost redeems him, and changes the reader's estimate of the whole book.

STEPHEN CALINARI: Julian Sturgis. *Scribner.* $1.50.

Beautiful, unaffected style is the most conspicuous quality. The tale shows the growth of a spoiled darling of wealth from an ambitious, conceited, clever boy into a man who has feared death and dared it, for whom a man has died, who has twice fancied that he loved, and has at last loved, and found his vocation in serving his fellow men.

TEMPTING OF FATHER ANTHONY: George Horton. *McClurg.* $1.25.

At a very early age, the son of a Greek priest desires to imitate St. Anthony and runs away to live in a cave, where he imagines that he has all the saint's temptations. Later he enters a monastery and is self-righteously shocked at the behavior of men of three times his age. In one case he has reason, but only in one. Lastly, his beauty attracts a handsome heiress, who takes him away and marries him, and he becomes a wine merchant. The first part is very amusing. The author treats the second as if it were hardly more serious.

TOM BEAULING: Gouverneur Morris. *Century.* $1.25.

Tom Beauling's mother brings him to an old friend of her girlhood and dies without telling his father's name. The friend adopts him and he develops into a very agreeable youth, and goes to the East and writes charming letters to a girl with whom he has fallen in love. At the very moment of his asking her father for her hand, the two men doubt that the elder may be the father of the younger, and the doubt is hardly dispersed for the reader.

TWENTIETH CENTURY BOY: Marguerite Linton Glentworth. *Lee.* $1.25.

A boy with no visible redeeming qualities makes life miserable for everybody in a summer boarding-house. He is a typical spoiled child of wealth, but hardly credible to those who have not seen him in the flesh. The book amuses childless folk, but is not for children.

UP AND DOWN THE SANDS OF GOLD: Mary Devereaux. *Little.* $1.50.

A love story of a man whom a noble girl loves, but gives him up to a rival, aids his suit, and nurses her through dangerous illness. The shrewd, quaint gossip of New England fishermen and their womenkind and the questions of an interesting boy form the lighter part of the story.

Juveniles.

AT THE POINT OF THE BAYONET: G. A. Henty. *Scribner.* $1.25, *net.*

An English officer's orphan son, reared among Mahrattas, obtains a commission and uses his knowledge of Hindu manners and customs to England's advantage. [Ten to fifteen years.]

BOY DONALD AND HIS CHUM: Penn Shirley. *Lee.* $0.75.

The heroes have innocent, amusing adventures in the country and in camp in California. No sauciness and no slang. [Five to eight.]

FIGHTING UNDER THE SOUTHERN CROSS: Claude H. Wetmore. *Wilde.* $1.50.

The story of the Chile-Peruvian war impartially told, with the adventures of certain English and American residents. [Ten and upward.]

FRIGATE'S NAMESAKE: Alice Balch Abbot. *Century.* $1.00, *net.*

A well-bred little girl named for the *Essex* hears the frigate's story from some interesting persons and sees many others. [Ten to twelve.]

GOLDEN ARROW: Ruth Hall. *Houghton.* $1.25, *net.*

Anne Hutchinson, Roger Williams, Mary Dyer, Sassacus, King Charles, the Duke of York, Goffe and Whalley, are among the real characters. The hero vows never to turn his back on any one in distress, and keeps his word. [Ten to fifteen.]

JOLLY CAT TALE: Amy Brooks. *Lee.* $1.00.

The mother cat makes clothes for the kittens, and they try to wear them, but cannot; fanciful and kindly, with good pictures by the author. [Six to ten.]

LEM: Noah Brooks. *Scribner.* $1.00, *net.*

An excellent account of boy-life in a well-to-do Massachusetts family living in a small old seaport 1830–1848. Related in the third person, but autobiographical. [Ten and upward.]

LITTLE MEN PLAY; LITTLE WOMEN PLAY: Elizabeth Lincoln Gould. *Little.* $0.50.

Dramatized version of scenes from Miss Alcott's books. Characters, both adult and childish, to be taken by children. Full directions as to costumes and stage setting, both of which are very simple. [Under ten.]

LONESOMEST DOLL: Abbie Farwell Brown. *Houghton.* $0.85, *net.*

The heroine belongs to a child-queen, and is the means of her learning how to play. Also she frightens away brigands, by squeaking "Mamma," and is very happy. [Five to ten.]

LUCY IN FAIRYLAND: Sophie May. *Lee.* $0.75.

Lucy hears a story in which she and her friend visit a land where everything can talk and the inhabitants are elves. [Four to ten.]

MORGAN'S MEN: John Preston True. *Little.* $1.20, *net.*

A fresh, spirited story of fighting with Tarleton, the hero being a youth who has been a spy in Tarleton's camp, and has brought away Tarleton's horse. The story is patriotic, not partisan, and the hero is a model officer. [Ten to fifteen.]

PRINCE HAROLD; A FAIRY STORY: L. F. Brown. *Page.* $1.50.

While the hero seeks his bride and during his honeymoon his monkey servant rules and reigns, and weds a monkey princess. Droll and not too infantile. [Six to ten.]

SPECTACLE MAN: Mary F. Leonard. *Wilde.* $1.00.

An amiable little heroine and a cheerful old spectacle man bring good fortune and happiness to many persons by always doing the nearest good work. [Eight to twelve.]

'TILDA JANE: Marshall Saunders. *Page.* $1.50.

Exaggerated kindness to animals taught in a story with a heroine who reforms her elders and talks endlessly. [Ten to fourteen.]